

ARCHBISHOP VS. PRIEST.

EVENTS OF THE WEEK RELATING TO THE CONTROVERSY.

Dr. Curran Astonishes Father Kearney by Celebrating Mass at St. Patrick's—Something About the Circular That the Priests Are Expected to Sign—St. Stephen's Parishioners Will Continue Their Agitation.

Rev. Dr. Curran returned to the city from his spiritual retreat on Easter Sunday morning. He spent the day with some friends, but went to the rectory of St. Patrick's in Mott street before the doors were bolted for the night and occupied his old room there. He rose in time to celebrate the 7:30 o'clock mass at the smaller altar in the church, and while preparing to do so Father Kearney, the pastor, became aware of his presence by meeting him in the church. Dr. Curran greeted the pastor with his customary politeness, bidding him good morning. Father Kearney replied in a different tone, inquiring of Dr. Curran how he dared to come to St. Patrick's. Dr. Curran explained that he looked upon St. Patrick's pastoral residence as his home while in the city, since he had never been permanently removed from it, and that he had, of course, come into the church to celebrate mass. Father Kearney rejoined excitedly with the declaration that Dr. Curran should not celebrate mass, reminding the doctor at the same time, that he was pastor. Dr. Curran replied, "I am aware of that, and I am your assistant." "No, you are not," said Father Kearney; "you were removed by the archbishop." This Dr. Curran denied, stating that he had been invited to go to Ellenville temporarily, and that no notice had ever been given him that he had been taken away from St. Patrick's. Father Kearney could not deny the statement, but he had other exciting topics to discuss with the doctor. "I don't see how you have the face to come back," he said, "after saying what you did about me in the papers. You said that I was a liar?" "No," said the imperturbable doctor, "I said that your statement to the archbishop that I neglected my duties while here was not true." Father Kearney appealed to the sexton of the church for a decision as to the facts, but the sexton sided with Dr. Curran. The pastor then reiterated his refusal to allow the doctor to say mass, but Dr. Curran was persistent in pushing his own determination, and at last Father Kearney held the point in controversy, remarking, "Well, we'll let him say mass this time." Dr. Curran smiled pleasantly, and proceeded to say mass as if nothing had happened. His bearing had been so cool and collected that Father Kearney himself could hardly take offense at it. After the mass Dr. Curran spent an hour in his room and then prepared to go out. Father Kearney met him at the door and gave him a note from the archbishop. In it the prelate directed Dr. Curran to proceed to Ellenville at his earliest convenience and remain there during the illness of the present rector. Dr. Curran went to Ellenville on Thursday.

It has been stated in several of the daily papers that in admiring Dr. Curran of the necessity of a ten days' season of reflection and prayer, the archbishop had given him the choice of three places of retreat. This is not a fact. The written decree of the archbishop designated the West Hoboken monastery as the place of Dr. Curran's incarceration.

THE CIRCULAR.

Priests Must Be Sought After in Order to Obtain Their Pledges of Loyalty.

The circular designed by the supporters of the archbishop to test the metal of the Catholic clergy of New York has been going the rounds of the parishes for signatures during the past week. Its most active promoter is Rev. Thomas F. Lynch, pastor of the Church of the Transfiguration in Mott street. The contents of the document seem to be guarded with vigilance, as no one has been able as yet to make them public. It is even alleged by a well informed clergyman that the younger priests are expected to sign the paper without having the time to read it, not to say scrutinize it. The pressure exerted upon them to cause them to append their names to it amounts to coercion.

Rev. James J. Doherty, pastor of St. Monica's church, called on the pastor of a prominent church who was formerly an assistant under Dr. McGlynn, and asked him to sign the pledge to the archbishop, telling him that "all the priests had signed it except two." "If that is the case I'll sign," said the priest. On discovery afterward that the statement was not based on fact, the priest erased his signature, saying as he did so: "I once had a little disagreement with Father McGlynn. I regret it, and now think he was in the right as between us. I'll now make amends by erasing my name from this paper."

In another case the same Father Doherty invited a young priest to sign the paper he was carrying around. When asked what it was he said it was a little testimonial to the archbishop, and the young man, trusting to the honor of the older priest, signed it. Rev. Gabriel A. Healy, pastor of St. Bernard's, Fourth street and Eighth avenue, called on a young priest and made the request that he sign the document. The young man hesitated, "Say yes or no?" "Suppose I say so," was the response, "what will be the consequence?" "You'll be under suspicion." "Under suspicion of what?" "Of disloyalty to the archbishop." "Well, if that's the meaning of it, if my loyalty is suspected without reason, I've manhood enough to say no. I'll not sign. Nobody has any cause to doubt me."

Rev. Nicholas J. Hughes, pastor of St. Mary's church, on Grand street, went to one of the archbishop's six councilors, a prominent pastor, and showed him the secret document. The councilor said sharply: "I'd be ashamed to be seen on the street with that in my hand!" Father Hughes went away, and called on another councilor. His petition or the reverend gentleman's signature drew forth a lecture from him, ending with the words, "Do you mean to insult me? Do you, yourself, intend to sign that?" And Father Hughes replied, a good deal abashed, "I don't think I shall." The young priests generally regard this as a good story on Father Hughes.

Rev. John Edwards, pastor of the church of the Immaculate Conception in East Fourth street, put the document before a young priest for his name, but was met with a refusal and such an expression of vexation as astonished him. Father Edwards said, "I am a priest of many years and would not dare to speak so freely."

AT ST. STEPHEN'S.

An Interview With Dr. Henry Carey—Dr. McGlynn's Friends Steadfast.

Dr. Henry Carey was seen at his residence, Thirtieth street and Second avenue, and asked what was the present feeling of St. Stephen's parishioners in relation to Dr. McGlynn's cause.

PROTECTED FRANCE.

HOW THE LANDLESS WORKERS MANAGE TO LIVE.

Low Wages for Workmen and Clerks—Postmen Working for \$2.75 a Week—Facts About Population—A Hue and Cry Against Foreign Labor.

BORDEAUX April 2.—The weekly wage of the workman in France, even in the large towns and cities, rarely exceeds \$5, and it is very often no more than \$4. In not a few instances men work seven days a week, or, at all events, for half the day on Sundays, making six days and a half per week, and they are occupied for ten and a half hours per day. When we come to persons employed in shops, we find they often work twelve or thirteen hours a day, and the shops open either the whole or half the day on the Sabbath. It is not customary to give any holidays other than the regular days that are officially laid down as public holidays or fêtes. I venture to think that your American workman would not support such a system for a single month. French clerks are paid about on a par with men of the same cloth in England, viz., \$5 a week; but the higher officers, such as cashiers, managers, etc., are not paid so well as in Great Britain. Perhaps those who are most favored in the matter of salaries are the English correspondents of the larger firms, while the Germans command little better figures than the French themselves, by the reason of the large number of them that can be found on every hand, and also from their willingness to accept low rates of pay. Some of these men are capital linguists; but, on the other hand, many of them possess a singular amount of exaggerated self-confidence, as I have known men apply for the post of English correspondent in French houses who have positively not understood me when I have said: "How do you do?" I know of one young man who actually obtained such a post, and it was three or four weeks before his employer, who was ignorant of the English language, discovered the linguistic deficiencies of his clerk.

Postmen in cities and large towns earn four dollars a week, but not so in the rural districts. I know an intelligent man, six-and-thirty years of age, of fair average education and obliging manner, who gains the magnificent stipend of \$2.75 per week. He has a scattered district, and as he has two deliveries of letters to make per diem, the whole of his time is occupied in his duties. He has a wife and two children to keep, and what is more, lives in a decent, humble dwelling, which costs him nearly one dollar a week. How can such folk exist? Twenty-five cents a day to provide food and raiment for two adults and two children, barring, of course, the postman's uniform!

I observe a paragraph in the *Gironde*, which states that "several wealthy landed proprietors in the Medoc have just reduced the wages of their laborers from 2 francs 50cts., to 1 franc 75cts. for the men, and from 1 franc to 75cts. for the women. The unfortunate people who have not accepted the reduction have been summarily dismissed." Now, the *Gironde* is the most widely circulated newspaper in the south of France, of thoroughly republican views, and not likely to misrepresent the wage-earning capabilities under the republic of France. In American money, therefore, the agricultural laborers of the Medoc will henceforth receive for his labors, that it must be remembered, endure from sunrise to sunset, the liberal sum of \$2.38 per week, if he works seven days a week and never has a moment, not even on the Sunday, to call his own, or \$2.04 per week if he has his Sabbath, and even then he has no half holiday on the Saturday. Shorter hours ought to be in vogue, a Saturday afternoon half holiday, less taxation and protection and similar nonsense, and larger wages. And yet I am bound to admit that the people are fairly content; there is little grumbling, no poor rates, and much, very much less poverty than in England.

Government and ecclesiastical appointments are by no means a fat sinecure that they are in the British Isles, and were I to give a detailed list of the salaries paid to high government functionaries, not only in France but often in the deadly climes of her distant colonies, I imagine that many of your readers would con the figures with unfeigned surprise. Take, for example, the cardinal archbishop of Paris, the highest ecclesiastical dignitary of one of the largest and fairest cities of the earth; a man of distinguished piety, high intellectual culture and exalted rank. He has the princely revenue of \$2,000 per annum. Though it may not be necessary that a follower of the lowly carpenter's son should be a duke with £15,000 a year, like his grace of Canterbury, England, surely such a man is entitled to receive a respectable income. With almost every article of diet dearer than in England, with lower wages and higher rents, it surely is a great credit to the French nation that so little actual poverty exists, and that so many of the laboring classes manage to build themselves a house and acquire a plot of ground.

The French chamber of deputies on Saturday last decided to increase the import duty on foreign oxen from twenty-five to thirty-eight francs, on cows from twelve to twenty francs, on calves from four to eight francs, on wethers and ewes from three to five francs, and on fresh meat from seven to twelve francs per 100 kilos.

The minister of the interior has just caused to be inserted in the *Journal Officiel* a table indicating by departments the total of the population, and the total is divided into two headings, viz., the French themselves, and the foreigners permanently inhabiting this country. These statistics form an interesting study. They prove, on the one hand, that the French population increases in an almost imperceptible degree, and, on the other hand, that the number of foreigners is constantly on the increase. There is evidently some connection between these two phenomena. The insufficiency of the native population favors the influx of strangers—it might almost be said, renders such an influx necessary. It is none the less true that in certain departments the influx of foreigners has assumed the character of a veritable invasion, an invasion which goes on slowly and peacefully, and which has undoubtedly certain advantages, but which is capable of assuming certain aspects of danger in the coming time with which it is not unnatural that the legislators seriously occupy themselves.

The departments which are specially invaded are, first, the Seine, because of the special attractions Paris possesses for the foreigner, and next the departments which are situated upon the frontier, or in close proximity to the frontier, such as Nord, Bouches-du-Rhône, Marseilles, Ardennes and Alpes-Maritimes. The Germans regard themselves as being at home at Nancy, the Belgians at Lille, the Italians at Nice and even at Marquette, these towns being so near their respective countries. There are so many of the Belgian laboring classes, workers in the manufactures and mines of the Nord, who every day perform their labors and take their dejeuners upon French territory, and who cross the frontier and take their evening meal in Belgium, where they can live more cheaply. The table inserted in the *Journal Officiel*, which is to entirely relied upon, inasmuch as it bears the signature of M. Goblet, president of the council, informs us that out of 38,218,903 human beings who reside in and pay the taxes imposed by France, there are 37,103,659 French subjects and 1,115,214 foreigners.

In certain towns and more especially

among the working classes, the hue and cry has been sent forth against foreigners, who are stated to be formidable competitors in the race of national labor. It has been remarked that it is as logical to impose restrictions upon the import of foreigners as it is to impose restrictions upon foreign products.

A proposition has been made that it would be advisable to place a tax upon foreigners residing upon French territory. Such a tax would assuredly possess a protectionist character, though it could hardly be said to be prohibitive. It is contended that the object would not be to prevent strangers from coming into France and settling here, but simply with the end of making them pay for the benefits of French civilization which they enjoy, and which have been cumulating for generations past. A writer calls this a "dread compensation."

The *Soleil* favors such a tax upon two conditions:

First, that the tax be moderate in amount and not more than from one to two per cent of the net income earned by foreigners; and second, that they should be "compensated" by laws which should facilitate or even impose upon them in case of need, the act of naturalization.

It is contended that the invasions of France by strangers would become a source of strength rather than a source of weakness, if it were possible to make the said foreigners into French citizens.

The course recommended is that it should be to the interest of foreigners to demand naturalization, and that they would thus be absorbed into the great French nation. The *Soleil* thinks that the imposition of a special income tax would be a powerful means of bringing about what is desired, for many foreigners would declare themselves as French citizens in order to escape the payment of this odious tax. The article in question continues:

"It is certainly unsatisfactory that the population of the French should remain stationary, while all the great countries which surround us, England, Germany, Italy, should see the number of their inhabitants increase with rapidity. But what can be done? It is no easy matter to change the *meurs* of the French nation. People cannot be forced to marry on attaining a certain age, and any measures which might be proposed upon the subject would be treated with universal ridicule. But in according naturalization to foreigners who reside in France, who gain their livelihood here, who are dependent upon us for their means of existence, and who, in consequence, have the same interest as ourselves in the maintenance of the tranquillity and prosperity of the country, the French population might be increased by a million people. It must be understood that strangers are welcome and will be received with open arms, but on the condition that they do not remain isolated in the midst of us."

ARNOLD DICKSON.

RENTS ON THE BOWERY.

The Views of a Man Who Pays \$6,000 a Year to a Landlord.

I Schackman, tailor, Bowery near Broome street, was interviewed a few days ago by a STANDARD reporter in regard to Bowery rents. He said there was, as a rule, hardly a living to be made by Bowery storekeepers on account of excessive rents. After a man had a business established the landlord ran the rent up on him every time his lease expired. It was very seldom a lease could be had for more than three years, and in most cases the lease was but for one year. The rents on the Bowery he regarded as more unreasonable than in any other locality in New York. It was a good retail business center, and that made it fit for agents and for shrewd men of some capital watchful for paying investments in real estate. He knew of several persons who were going out of business this spring, as they did not make their rents. One was himself an owner of real estate situated in another part of the city, and as he expressed it, was well enough off to live without working for another landlord. Mr. Schackman thought that the average rent of a store on the Bowery was \$2280 feet, was \$3,000 a year. This was without a basement or other room in the building. With short leases tenants put very little money on improvements and disregarded sanitary conditions. The pace at which landlords went in putting up rents was much faster than the advance in desirability of Bowery stores. The sole question was, what could the tenant pay. Mr. Schackman believed that in general the storekeepers tried to do as well as possible by their employees, but the enormous rents had to be met on the first of the month. This was what made retailers open shop on Sunday against the law, and caused them reluctantly to promise early closing to the labor unions. He himself pays \$6,000 a year for one room, 40 by 60 feet, on the ground floor. Mr. Schackman is himself a house owner and a close observer, and he believes he can look on the question of rents without bias in either direction. He says that if the working people can find means of reducing the rents paid by business men, they will get some of the money now going to landlords. A man in business paying \$6,000 a year rent would, if it came down to \$3,000, be in a position to give his employees better wages.

Malibus Illustrated.

Correspondence: New York Herald.

CHATTANOOGA, Tenn., April 8.—A singular difficulty has arisen here as the result of the real estate boom which has prevailed for three months. Some time since a syndicate of capitalists purchased a large tract of land almost in the center of the city called Stone fort, which on account of its rock and uneven condition has been allowed to become occupied by negro tenants, at least two hundred small houses having been put up for their occupancy. These two hundred families since the new purchase have been notified to vacate this property at once, and they will have to leave. There is not a vacant house in the city that they can get, and Chattanooga is now confronted with the problem of what to do with 200 families who are turned out of house and home.

The purchasers propose to improve the property, level it off and make it available for business and residences. The poor people will have to get off during the coming week, and what to do with them nobody knows. In several other portions of the city where property has heretofore been occupied by poor classes, and which property has been passed into new hands, the tenants have also been ordered off to make room for improvements. It is safe to say that during the coming week, if these notices are insisted upon, there will be hundreds of homeless families in Chattanooga, with no homes that they can rent.

The departments which are specially invaded are, first, the Seine, because of the special attractions Paris possesses for the foreigner, and next the departments which are situated upon the frontier, or in close proximity to the frontier, such as Nord, Bouches-du-Rhône, Marseilles, Ardennes and Alpes-Maritimes. The Germans regard themselves as being at home at Nancy, the Belgians at Lille, the Italians at Nice and even at Marquette, these towns being so near their respective countries. There are so many of the Belgian laboring classes, workers in the manufactures and mines of the Nord, who every day perform their labors and take their dejeuners upon French territory, and who cross the frontier and take their evening meal in Belgium, where they can live more cheaply. The table inserted in the *Journal Officiel*, which is to entirely relied upon, inasmuch as it bears the signature of M. Goblet, president of the council, informs us that out of 38,218,903 human beings who reside in and pay the taxes imposed by France, there are 37,103,659 French subjects and 1,115,214 foreigners.

In certain towns and more especially

RACK RENTS IN CHICAGO.

What the Proprietors of Boarding Houses and Furnished Rooms are Forced to Pay.

Chicago Enquirer.

There is a system of rack renting practiced upon a class of people in Chicago, which for cold-blooded robbery and inhuman ghouliness equals in horror even the eviction scenes over which the humane element of all classes of people are so justly indignant. It seems almost incredible that there should exist in a civilized country a class of people who could become so utterly lost to every sense of justice or consistency as those who own and rent out the houses to which I refer. The rent of these houses has been placed at such unreasonable figures, and is so entirely out of proportion to the earnings of the business of the renters as to render it impossible for such people to carry on their business with any hope of success or even the prospect of a bare existence.

I know a lady who has been keeping a flat of furnished rooms for four years on a prominent street in the city, who expended at the beginning of her term \$600 for furniture, and in addition to four years of laborious work in taking care of her rooms, which have been occupied for the most part of the time, she has been compelled to draw upon other resources to keep up her expenses until several hundred dollars besides her earnings have been absorbed by the exorbitant rent she has been compelled to pay. Another lady who has been renting a flat in a very favored section of the city, which she furnished at a cost of \$700 about four years ago, is paying more rent to-day than she is receiving from her rooms, and tells me that she has often been compelled to do sewing to make up the deficit in her rent bill, which the business fails to supply. I know another family keeping rooms where the lady and her three children are kept constantly at work in the business, and the rooms all occupied, and yet she is often compelled to draw for rent on the salary of her husband.

But the most startling feature of the business, and one which humanity shudders to contemplate, is the fact that thousands of these furnished rooms are occupied by girls who work in factories and stores, whose wages are utterly insufficient for their support; many of them being driven to prostitution, thus converting a great number of places, even in respectable parts of the city, into secret houses of assignation. A lady has told me of a highly respectable gentleman who owns the entire block in which her apartments are situated. She complained to the gentleman of the high rent she was forced to pay for her flat, and told him frankly that it would be impossible for her to rent from him at such figures, and keep a respectable house, and that she would keep no other kind. The gentleman, or rather the fiend, coolly informed her that she was too particular, and that he could give no reduction in rent, as much as to say: You must concede to my unreasonable demand for rent even if you have to avail yourself of the fruits of prostitution to obtain it.

The Right Gospel.

The Royalton Minn., Banner, pointing out what would follow if land values were taxed, says: "As fast as the landowner can make his land into grain, into cotton, hemp, into vegetables, into sheep and horses and cattle and houses and barns and pianos and organs, that fast does he approach the goal of his youthful dreams of comfort and prosperity. He will, rather than permit any of his land to go to tax sale, employ three men and teams where he now employs one. His land will be made to produce thirty and forty bushels of wheat to the acre where he now barely squeezes out ten or twenty. He will pasture one cow on one acre in place of one on four acres. The whole ingenuity of the farmer and the inventor will be devoted to that idealistic agricultural task getting the most out of little ground, instead of getting a little out of the most ground. The millions that are invested in real estate, which in the hands of speculators retard the growth of every country, straggling 'settlements' from New York to Portland, would be thrust into the channels of trade and become living arteries, carrying the life blood of employment and prosperity to every part of the body politic. The man who has a lot of unproductive real property will either let it go to tax sale, or else he will build on it or garden it. He will have to make it produce something. Instead of hunting out objects for taxation, strike the shackles off both capital and labor by making them free from taxation."

Keep on Thinking, Canada.

Toronto (Ont.) Daily Globe.

In the discussion of Mr. Balfour's bill respecting line fences between farms the prejudice of county and township councils against absentee owners of unoccupied land was mentioned. It was said that local feeling would utilize the proposed act to force the fencing of vacant tracts, and thus put the absences to expense. To us it seems that the local feeling is entirely right and sound. The county and township councils would receive power to levy special taxes on unoccupied tracts if our system of taxation were not radically wrong. The absences are speculating in the unoccupied increment, i.e., in the work and outlay of

GOING INTO BUSINESS.

EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYES IN BEN FRANKLIN'S TRADE.

The Printing Office of 1829 and That of 1887—What Are the Chances for Printers' Talent in New York—Old Saws That Will Not Answer at the Present Day.

A gauzy little story, with its big moral, written in the vein of the fictions printed in the Sunday school papers, was republished in last week's *STANDARD* from the *Independent*. A Deserving Poor Workingman was walking homeward from work with a Shiftless and Envious Workingman, when a Wealthy Gentleman rode by in a splendid carriage. Deserving Poor admired the turnout, and declared that he, too, should one day ride in his carriage. But Shiftless and Envious asked what right the Wealthy Gentleman had to live in such luxury and idleness, while he, who worked so hard, had nothing, and he said he believed he would all his days be next to a beggar. And Deserving Poor managed well, lived on less than he earned, became an honest contractor, and finally accumulated a large fortune. And Shiftless and Envious always kept himself poor by spending all his earnings. Then follows the moral of universal application: "Workingmen in this country, if they will practice industry and economy, dispensing with all unnecessary expenses, and living on less than they earn, will gradually become capitalists, to a moderate extent, at least, and some of them will become rich." Lastly, a slap at the labor organizations.

Miss Pennyalmsgiver might spin this little yarn to Polly Drudge and the simple young lady might believe it to be true, and the ignorant menial might fall into a fit of penance over it at the thought of that dime which she spent for the only ribbon she bought last season. Or old Professor Philanthropist might relate the story while visiting a charity school, and the boys there would be edified by it and make good resolutions on the head of it. But in the workingman's workshop life will it stand sifting?

The inquiry as to whether skill, industry, sobriety and enterprise, unaided by patronage or capital, have a fair chance for reward in this country, could be answered completely by taking up the list of occupations as they are printed in the census reports and ascertaining the relation of the wage-workers in each to the employing and wealth holding classes. In most of the mechanical occupations it would be seen that the factory system has superseded all other systems, and that the factory hand is generally no more than an attendant at a machine or a worker at some subdivision of a branch of what was formerly a trade. The production of nearly all kinds of goods in the hands of combinations of manufacturers or monopolized by large firms possessing superior facilities for placing their articles upon the market. Labor saving machinery is taking the places of mechanics and driving them into idleness or reducing them to the level of the unskilled.

Let the printing business be taken for an example. There hangs on the walls of the office of the typographical union in New York the printing of a printing office of the year 1829. A pressman is at work on a Ramage hand press, and about the room are seen the appliances of that day for setting type, binding books and ruling blank books. Perhaps all the plants of such an office could have been bought for \$2,000, and the pressman at work was capable, no doubt, of performing every process in the production of a book or newspaper. The man who made this sketch of the office in which he worked in 1829 is still living. The walls of the office of the typographical union are not large enough to contain a pictorial gallery of the many branches into which the trade of printing is now divided, and pictures would have to be added constantly to depict the rapidly changing processes in connection with the business.

In 1870 the eight, ten or twelve cylinder press used in the press rooms of the daily newspapers was considered a marvelous machine. To feed the cylinder presses and the folding machines there were then employed in a daily newspaper office in New York from twenty to fifty persons. The press now used in such an office feeds itself, prints, cuts into sheets, folds and counts the papers. The scores of feeders who were formerly employed in press rooms are now earning and saving, in order to become employers, in that indefinite haven of those ousted by machinery—"some other occupation." If, as is a common argument, machinery usually creates more employment, this class of operatives have not found it to be so in their own business. Machine makers have not found a greater demand for their handwork, either, in building new presses, for the machines of the latest design are more simple in construction than the older ones, and turn out many more finished sheets per hour.

In the book printing offices the presses of the new make are also capable of being run with less labor and of doing better work than those of the style in general use twenty years ago. New folding machines and new sewing machines in the book bindery are throwing girls out of work and performing in a day a quantity of work that formerly took up a week. In large binderies the work of binding books is subdivided to such an extent that an operative working at the trade tools for years at a single subdivision of it, such as embossing, rounding, backings, cutting, pasting or sewing. Forty years ago a bookbinder could have set himself up in business with \$150. Today the necessary machinery for a modest bindery costs at least \$5,000. In blank book manufacturing, improvements in machinery have been made within ten years that render it unprofitable for some machinery constructed previously to be worked at all. In other words, the owner of a small blank book factory, operating with his old style machinery, would lose more money the more he worked, and if he had the energy, skill and business talents of a tip-top captain of industry, he would go to ruin much the sooner. It would be as if a man were to start to ride on horseback to San Francisco in order to save car fare and put up at the highest priced hotels on the way.

Type composing machines are in use in half a dozen large offices in New York. While it is a fast compositor who can set 10,000 ems a day, a team of three machine operators can average 60,000 ems a day if working on re-prime copy and not required to change the length of the lines. The first cost of the composing machine and its liability to get out of repair stand in the way of its general adoption, but compositors generally take it for granted that a machine or a process may at any time be invented which will take the place of the hand compositor in plain typesetting.

There are establishments in the city where nothing but presswork is done. Scott's, running through from Spruce to Frankfort street, has presses by the dozen at work night and day, the forms being carried there from numerous composing rooms scattered about the lower part of the city. It would be a smart pressman who could run off work on a single press in a small office at as low a rate as one of Scott's presses can do it.

All who know anything at all of the weekly press of the country are aware that hundreds of the smaller papers are printed on one side in a large city establishment and supplied to their proprietors at a cost but little above that of white paper, as the same "matter" appears in many of them, and the advertisements inserted by the wholesale house

printing these papers repay the cost of the work. This class of newspapers are known to the trade as "patent insides." Within five years another process has played havoc among compositors. Stereotype plates are sent by express from several cities to the country press, the plates being but the eighth of an inch thick, and fitted into the forms on movable and adjustable bases. Telegraphic news matter is thus prepared and forwarded in the morning for points within 150 miles of New York, arriving in time for use in the evening papers. Miscellaneous matter goes more slowly, but reaches many more papers. This plate matter is recognized by the union printers as capable of irretrievable damage to the craft both in diminishing wages and lessening opportunities for obtaining work. There have been many newspapers started in small towns through the means of plates. These little towns will soon be sending out a horde of half-taught and low-priced compositors, for small country offices but rarely have employment for journeymen. The larger weeklies and the daily papers of the third-rate cities also use plate matter, the effect being to increase the size of the papers somewhat, but at the same time to lessen on the whole the amount of work for compositors. Another use for plate matter, and one which is a menace to the scale of wages, is that in case of strike it can be relied on to fill up the forms.

In addition to the changes in the New York printing office growing out of new methods and improved machinery, the work of the trade has been split off into many divisions, and with few exceptions, each of these divisions is monopolized by a few houses, the monopoly being established and controlled through the possession of facilities not attainable by a beginner. Who would think to-day of entering into the business of manufacturing school books in the face of the poor supplying the country with them and employing the usual modes of a pool in crushing opposition? What working printer would dream of starting a daily newspaper or a monthly magazine after looking over the list of failures in these lines during the past ten years?

The savings of a printer's lifetime would be unequal to the purchase of a single press in a daily newspaper office. No combination of merit and genius can cope with the problem of competing with the four large theatrical printing offices of the city, its three color printing firms, its half dozen law printing establishments, or its three railway printing houses. Once or twice in a decade talent, character and capital unite and successfully build up a new printing office in New York. This is usually done, however, through large capitalists seeking investments for their money and compelling offices already established to yield a share of their patronage and in part release their grip upon the increasing volume of work in the way of printing. Again, some enterprising persons may perceive apart from the common line of work a little need for a new office that may in time grow to be a great office. This is the direction for the exercise of a business talent that is much vaunted and flattering to self—foreign—and the printers who have believed that they had that talent and had discovered a need are surprising in number. As a consequence there are ex-proprietors of printing offices at the ease in every office in the city. Taking the waste of capital and the wages that might have been earned if these ex-proprietors had never made their business ventures, the aggregate loss to the working members of the printing fraternity, through unsuccessful attempts to become employers, will bear comparison with what has been thrown away by the shiftless.

Several managers of printing offices have lately been interviewed by the writer in relation to the question of building up a paying establishment. Mr. T. J. Rooney, manager of the Concord Co-operative company, 49 Centre street, pays \$900 a year rent for an establishment now having about \$5,000 worth of material in it. He had lately sought better quarters in his neighborhood, but found nothing that rented under \$1,200 which answered his purposes. He had had his eye on a new building near by, while it was in course of construction, and thought he might take it in a room 25 by 75 feet. But its rent turned out to be \$2,000 a year. Mr. Rooney thinks that \$30,000 is required to set up an office which can expect to compete in any of the larger lines of the printing business. Mr. McWilliams, of Elm street, said that he thought \$50,000 might start a book printing office. The smaller offices generally made barely a living over their rent, which was sure to rise if the office depended on its locality for its good will. He had once gone to a place that was worthless for any one else, but as soon as he had made it pay the rent was run up to a point that compelled him to remove. Mr. C. G. Bourgoine, whose large business has been built up in the past fifteen years, said there was \$80,000 invested in his office. An office that could bid for work of any class might be established for \$150,000; but in order to do all kinds of work a quarter of a million would be needed. The day of the small printer had gone by. He had a number of ex-proprietors working for him. He made money by doing quick work in a "flexible" office. His hands could be transferred from one department to another, and thus an immense amount of work done at a low cost. He does work for a dozen smaller offices. His landlord had raised his rent promptly on the expiration of his lease. Landlords give printing offices short leases. Mr. William J. Kelly, the publisher of the *Model Printer*, thought that it was hardly practical to decide upon any figure as the amount necessary to set up the plant of a complete printing office. The division of the trade into branches prevents any one from attempting to follow them all, either as employer or employee. Nearly all the owners of small offices are at a standstill or going backward. Rent takes their profits.

All there are about 200 printing offices in New York, a large majority of them, however, being small concerns, doing commercial printing and employing only a few persons. In New York the compositors number about 4,000. The piece hands in the book trade do not average \$13 a week the year round. The morning newspaper piece hands average \$16 a week, and before getting a regular situation a compositor will very often wait two years in the position of a substitute. A large proportion of printers do not obtain work regularly.

The printing office of 1829, with its few primitive tools, is no longer in existence. From it have sprung daily newspaper offices, book printing offices, job offices, binderies, blank book factories, lithographing, engraving, labeling and color printing establishments. The wage worker is now seldom successful in becoming an employer. The men are as good as they were in old times, but conditions have changed. But in 1887 the goody-goody press and public teachers who are either ignorant men or falsifiers are still telling the pretty little stories and repeating the stale and inapplicable maxims of 1829.

An Organization in Portchester.

A number of citizens of Portchester, N. Y., in sympathy with the great reform which THE STANDARD advocates, recently associated themselves into a club for mutual intellectual improvement, and will shortly open a room where entertainments and debates can be held. John McMackin has recently visited the town and made a stirring speech before the association. The officers are: Andrew Moore, president; William Coddington, secretary and John Wasson, treasurer. The executive committee are: Thomas Whaler, Michael McCoy, James Roach, Thomas Burke, John Lyon, J. Henry Schmell and Fred Hupper.

PLANTATION LIFE TO-DAY.

INDUSTRIAL SLAVERY FAR MORE CRUEL THAN THAT EXISTING BEFORE THE WAR.

A short time ago the writer visited a large sugar plantation called Cote Blanche, situated upon an island of the same name, in St. Mary's parish, La., which may be taken as a fair specimen of existing plantations in Louisiana.

Cote Blanche is owned by a resident of New Orleans, who leases it to another resident of New Orleans, who in turn employs an overseer, who directs the laborers. The overseer lives in a large frame dwelling near the hovels of the laborers.

These hovels are arranged on both sides of a long street. Each consists of two rooms, one used as kitchen, dining room, and, in fact, general living room, and the other for sleeping. They are built of ordinary boards, loosely put together, whitewashed on the outside, and dirty as pigsties inside. Some of them are occupied by negroes; others by white men. Most of the occupants have their families with them, and as many as seven or eight human beings live in a single hut, together with dogs, pigs, turkeys and other animals. The exact wages paid to these people is impossible to state, but that their earnings are small may be inferred from their way of life.

As things are now, the small tradesman is very much overworked and care laden. From fourteen to sixteen hours a day he is obliged to be at the orders of any five cent customer, and he has no time for regular meals. His profits are not fixed, and he is unable to say what will be left to reward his exertions until close on to rent day, as much depends on the state of business during the last few days. Business may not come, but rent day surely will come. The landlord in the meanwhile watches keenly how his tenant improves his business, and does not fail to take advantage of the first opportunity to raise his rent. The wholesale dealer will only consent to renew his mortgage on the retailer's stock at two or three per cent advance, and so the fines increase as the unhappy small dealer becomes more helpless. But they are still blind to the cause of their troubles, and hope that times once more will become flush, though in what way they cannot tell. Some would like to get out of business if they could and go back to their craft, but the ranks are overcrowded. Some would like to till the soil, but the prices at which speculators hold land prevent them. Every natural opportunity is cut off from the needy, everywhere toll must be paid to somebody. So the man remains in his store trying to increase his profits by selling adulterated goods or cheating on the weight.

God knows it is not always stupidity that makes him do that. It is a matter of "to be or not to be?" He wants to keep his name out of the bankruptcy court; he wants to pay the exorbitant rent; he wants to pay the additional two or three per cent on the note he must renew; he wants to prevent the jobber from selling him out and putting his family in the street. For much of that poisoning, for much of that cheating they are responsible who have enclosed or barred the avenues to nature's riches.

Before the war slaves had a value. They were often beaten and ill-treated, and in many instances had to be goaded to their work by the slave-driver. But generally speaking, the slaves enjoyed life. They had no cares; they were housed, fed, clothed, and when sick taken care of until their recovery. The master was to some extent responsible for their well-being. Each one was personally known to him and his family, and in their old age they were not worked. Their life, compared to that of those who to-day take their places, was as heaven to hell. The difference is that those to-day have no value; the desire on the part of the master to get a comfortable living out of their exertions has given place to a rapacious greed to get all out of them that the limit of human endurance will allow; no need now to flog them; the fear of starvation is a sufficient incentive. Every avenue of escape is so monopolized that countless numbers stand ready at a moment's notice to step into vacant places. Now the ownership is not personal. The master does not know his slave by face or name. If the slave falls sick and can pay for a doctor himself, well and good; if not, it would be preposterous to expect the master to pay for one for him. And then again it is a philanthropic action on the part of the master to give employment to the workman and thus offer a fellow being the opportunity to avoid death by starvation!

The owner of this island lives in New Orleans. He receives a large rent from the man who leases his land. The latter also lives in New Orleans. Neither does a stroke of work. Both live handsomely, surrounded by every luxury. The slave-driver or overseer, employed by the man who leases the land, receives a compensation, but does no work except to direct the slaves. Where does all this wealth come from? A child whose ideas were not all confused by the modern political economy would say it is created by the laborers in the hovels. Does it belong to the two New Orleans gentlemen? The law of the land says it does; the law of God says no.

The two absentee landlords are indifferent as to how their money comes, and they leave everything to the slave-driver, whose position, in part, depends upon his cruelty. But the responsibility is clear enough. It rests with the people of the United States, and unless they look into these matters and do something to eradicate the evils that are now rapidly eating away our institutions and making the emancipation act a hollow joke, there will be a reign of terror in this land; for men can be goaded to desperation now just as they were in the last century!

JOHN S. WALTERS.

A SLAVERY THAT SOCIETY CONDONES.

CINCINNATI, O., April 6.—Here is a part of an interview with ex-Governor Bookwalter of Ohio, by Gath (George Alfred Townsend), as published recently in the *Enquirer* of this city:

"How came you, as an Ohio man, to be interested in Kansas and Nebraska?"

"It is a matter of speculation, or rather of investment, for I never sell anything. A good deal of that land was for sale very cheap. Much of it cost no more than seventy-five cents an acre. It was not inviting looking land, because it seemed to be a light sandy soil. That was my first impression, and therefore I did not buy above 20,000 acres of it. Looking up the question of soils, however, I found that beneath the sandy surface was the primordial or basic soil, which is the richest on the globe. I hastened to buy some more land, and when I got about 60,000 acres they shut down on me and would not sell any more. The railroad companies found that they had too good a thing."

"How do you manage that land?"

"I keep an agent there all the time, who looks after nothing else. I put out the land on leasehold; some of it pays \$2 an acre per annum, which did not cost that amount."

The narrative with which Bookwalter narrates how he has an income of \$2 per year per acre from land that cost him less than half that is simply charming! It fills one with chagrin to think that society can look on such a system with admiration. If Bookwalter published to the world that he owned a lot of slaves, who are working his western lands for him, and that off their labor he and his family live, society would be shocked at the heartlessness and brutality of the thing. But this is different!

B. C. KEELER OF CHICAGO.

LAND REFORM IN NEW ZEALAND.

CHARLES CLAYTON of Westport, New Zealand, an ardent advocate of the common right to land, recently sent a letter to Robert Stout, the premier of the colonial government, requesting him to introduce a radical land reform bill into the house of representatives, having for its purpose the destruction of land monopoly and the abolition of all taxes save a single land tax. The premier replied that it would be impossible for him to draft such a bill and said: "The subject is one that cannot be settled in an off-hand manner. It requires grave consideration, and it wants more; it requires the popular mind to be trained to the fact that land is not like other property, and that the state has rights over land which it cannot possess over personal property. No doubt the agitation which is going on by Henry George and others, however, one may differ with them, will be of great assistance to us in our efforts to draft such a bill."

THE TESTIMONY OF A BUILDER.

The Washington, D. C., *Star* prints the following interview with a prominent builder of that city, C. C. Martin: "I don't think," said Mr. Martin, "the prospects for this year are as good as they were in old times, but conditions have changed. But in 1887 the goody-goody press and public teachers who are either ignorant men or falsifiers are still telling the pretty little stories and repeating the stale and inapplicable maxims of 1829."

A PLAN FOR POLITICAL ORGANIZATION.

URIAH B. THOMAS of San Francisco has issued in handy book form a proposed plan for political organization in the form of a party constitution, the provisions of which may be usefully consulted by political organization committees.

THE SMALL TRADESMAN.

HOW HE IS CRUSHED TO THE WALL BY THE INCREASE OF RENT.

SAN ANTONIO, Tex., April 4.—There is a class of people who, as a body, are as much interested in the struggle for social reform as the toiling masses below them. I refer to the small tradesmen. For a number of years, through personal contact and community of interest, I have had an opportunity of witnessing their hard struggle to keep their heads above water. Yet few realize what the real cause of their trouble is. They ignore the fact that as the opportunities of finding employment are diminishing and the return for such exertion decreasing year by year those who would be their customers have less and less with which to make purchases. Here and there, one more intelligent than another, has found that he is paying a rent out of proportion to the business he is doing; that the interest on borrowed money is too high; that the overcharge on goods he is compelled to buy on credit, is enough to prevent him from ever making any headway. But the majority seem to have no idea of the fundamental causes of their endless slavery. Some even imagine that the workingmen's fight is not theirs. "If the laborer would only quit striking and keep at work," they say, "our business would not be so bad."

As things are now, the small tradesman is

WHAT WILL CERTAINLY CAUSE TROUBLE.

THE GREAT PROSPERITY OF THE SOUTH GOES TO ENRICH THE LAND OWNERS.

CHICAGO, Ill., March 26.—The *Morriston (Tenn.) Pilot* reprints from another paper: "There is one danger that may possibly cause some trouble in the growing industrial centers of the south, unless steps are taken to prevent it. The rapid rise in the value of real estate and the large increase in consequence in house rents must necessarily be very seriously felt by mechanics. Either their wages must be proportionately increased, thus enlarging the cost of manufactured goods, or they will be driven to seek work elsewhere, unless a remedy can be found. To secure a prosperous and contented laboring class there must not only be cheap rents, but also the opportunity of purchasing homes at moderate prices. The south cannot afford to ignore this question. If real estate is to continue on the upward move within the limits of these cities, then there must be provision made for reaching the suburbs by cheap transportation, and there arrangements must be made whereby the workers can secure homes."

Here is a note of alarm right from the center of that new south, whose amazing prosperity of late is a subject of constant comment; and it serves as an excellent illustration of the effects of private ownership of land.

SOCIALISM IN GERMANY.

RAPID SPREAD OF SOCIALISTIC DOCTRINES—BISMARCK'S INFFECTIVE OPPOSITION.

BORDEAUX, April 2.—The last elections for the Reichstag have gone to prove that socialism has made considerable strides in Germany since the war of 18

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
2 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE:

One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the post office, New York, as second class
matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient postage is sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 1887.

The STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Friday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

JUSTICE TO THE ARCHBISHOP.

The scandal which Archbishop Corrigan is causing by his attempts to reduce to slavish submission the clergy of his diocese; his evident determination, as far as in him lies, to crush out among the priests of New York all freedom of political conviction, and to use the authority of the Catholic church to support corrupt political cliques and to prevent any questioning of social wrongs, ought to arouse among Catholics far more serious thoughts than those which find expression in condemnations of the conduct of the man. That the individual who now holds the position of archbishop of New York is too little a man for such an important place—that he lacks the intellectual grasp, the keen sense of justice and the popular sympathies needed in the official head of the Catholic church in the largest of American dioceses; that he displays the vindictiveness of the spoiled and petted miss, instead of the calm and kindly discretion of a manhood ripened by experience of the struggles and trials of life, and by realization of the vanity of selfish aims; and that he, by virtue of his office, a chief shepherd, seems anxious only that the wolves who fatten on his flock shall have full meals, is all true enough. But the important question is, how did such a man get into such a place? The Catholic church in New York is predominantly the church of the poor. How is it that the local head of that church is such a sympathizer with the rich that he wrenches authority to persecute those among his priests who dare to claim for the poor equally with the rich their heritage as children of God? These are questions of an importance that go far beyond any matter of individual action or personal character.

The original constitution of the Catholic church is intensely democratic. Primitive Christianity was essentially a revolt of the poor against the rich, an assertion of the equality and brotherhood of all the children of a common Creator. It did not appeal to arms; it made its appeal to something more potent, the consciences and the hearts of men. It was this that made the Roman masters of the world, with all their philosophical indifference to what their subject millions believed as to the nature of the gods or the destiny of the soul, persecute so bitterly the adherents of a faith which taught that the one true God was no respecter of persons, but that in His sight and in respect to His bounty the poorest plebeian and the richest patrician, the meanest slave and the proudest emperor, stood on an equal plane. To those whose ruthless luxury was fed by the sweat and blood of embruted millions, this was "socialism, communism and anarchism" of the most dangerous sort, and men and women who professed such "destructive doctrines" as that of the common fatherhood of God were torn to pieces, fed to lions, done to death in all the most cruel ways that a devilish ingenuity could conceive. But the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church, and at last Christianity emerged triumphant from the long struggle. Then the rich and the high born made haste to profess it, and began to intrigue for its dignities, often so successfully that, while the working priesthood still sprang from the people and remained in sympathy with them, the high places of the church, where the spirit of aristocracy was powerful, came too often to be deemed the prerogatives of noble birth, and even when a man of the people rose to ecclesiastical rank it was but to be received as a member of a ruling class.

Against the long dominance of aristocratic ideas the spirit of democracy has slowly made its way; but it is a remarkable fact that in the country where democratic ideas have reached fullest development the organization of the Catholic church is even yet more essentially aristocratic than in the Catholic monarchies of Europe. Two American bishops have recently been made cardinals—members of that body which elects the head of the Catholic church. Those who have read the newspaper accounts of their installation will have noticed that each of these bishops on becoming a cardinal was required to take the titular pastorate of a parish church in Rome. This was something more than a mere form. It is as pastor of parish churches in the diocese of Rome that the cardinals are entitled to a voice in the selection of a bishop of Rome, who, by virtue of that office, becomes the head of the church. This assumption of Roman pastorships by Cardinals Gibbons and Taschereau is a survival of the ancient democratic usage by which the bishop was chosen by the priests of his diocese.

But in the United States, where political institutions are based upon democratic ideas, the priests of a diocese

are as completely ignored in the selection of their bishop as though they did not exist. Just as the Catholic laymen of the United States are powerless in the selection or retention of the priest whom they support, so in their turn the priests are powerless in the selection of the bishop to whom they are subject.

Thus does it come about that a man of such ordinary capacity and of antecedents so undistinguished as the present incumbent has become archbishop of New York. Such a man could never have been chosen or even nominated by the clergy of New York. They would no more have selected him to succeed Archbishop McCloskey than the parishioners of St. Stephen's would have chosen Father Donnelly to succeed Dr. McGlynn.

Archbishop Corrigan has never worked his way up the rounds of the ladder of ecclesiastical promotion in which he stands so high. He has never been a parish priest, or even curate. He has never had the opportunity to acquire the practical knowledge of human nature and the warm sympathy with the poor and lowly that come to the priest whose daily life and ministrations bring him close to the hearts and lives of the people. His experience until he became a bishop was merely that of the schoolroom. From the life of the pupil he passed to that of the schoolmaster, with all its narrowing tendencies of undisputed sway over inferiors; and from a ruler of boys whose unquestioning obedience had accustomed him to regard himself as a superior being he was inflicted upon the diocese of Newark, whence he was at length transferred to the devoted diocese of New York.

If Archbishop Corrigan is a sympathizer with the rich, it should in charity be remembered that his life has been such as to make that natural, if not inevitable. But further than this, he himself, as archbishop of New York, is not only a prince in the power he exercises over his ecclesiastical subordinates, but is in the receipt of princely revenues. It is but natural that he should have a fellow feeling for the rich, since he is one of their number.

The priests of New York receive salaries ranging from four to eight hundred dollars per annum. But the official income of the archbishop of New York, it is hard to say what it amounts to?

In the first place he is furnished with a marble palace, equipped and maintained free of cost to him.

In the second place, he receives from the funds of the cathedral a salary of \$5,000 a year.

In the third place, he receives from each church in the diocese what is called a cathedralum, being an annual payment of \$200 a year each from all but the poorest churches. This cathedralum probably aggregates not less than \$15,000 a year.

In the fourth place, he receives a fee of \$1 for every interment in Calvary cemetery, the great burial ground of the Catholics of New York. According to the official statistics there were in Calvary cemetery last year 14,374 burials from New York city alone, while from Brooklyn and other cities the interments in this vast cemetery during the same time must have aggregated at least half as many more. Thus the income of the archbishop from this source alone must be over \$20,000, which, added to the two previous items, gives him at least \$40,000 a year—the income, calculated at four per cent, of a millionaire.

But this is not all. Besides this \$40,000 a year which Archbishop Corrigan draws mainly from the hard earnings of the poor, and especially from the tax for burial in consecrated ground, which falls so ruthlessly upon them in their hour of sorest distress, he is continually in receipt of large fees and gifts from the wealthy.

In view of these figures, it is hardly to be wondered at that Archbishop Corrigan, in a recent pastoral, should liken himself to a "sentinel on the ramparts of a city under siege," and deem it his duty to sound this alarm:

"Therefore, we command you, brethren, to be zealously on your guard against certain unsound principles and theories which assail the rights of property."

Forty thousand dollars a year, besides a marble palace and items not easily ascertainable, certainly tend to make even an archbishop zealous for the rights of property.

It is worth the consideration of Catholics who have been scandalized by the recent course of Archbishop Corrigan to ask themselves whether there is not fault in the system as well as in the man.

There is certainly nothing in Catholic faith to require the selection of a bishop without regard to the judgment and wishes of those whose experience is most valuable and who are most vitally interested in the choice. And while it is proper that a bishop, like a priest, should be maintained in comfort and with a decent regard to the dignity of his station, yet to permit him to take the income of a millionaire is certainly to dull his sympathy with the sufferings and trials of the toiling men and women who constitute the great body of the Catholic fold, and to dispose him to look with complacency upon the monstrous inequalities in the distribution of wealth which shame our so-called Christian communities.

THE LESSON OF CONVICT IDLENESS.

The first month of enforced idleness in Sing Sing prison is over, and the deficit to be provided for by the taxpayers of the state is nearly \$8,000. This deficit will probably increase month by month for some time to come, as existing contracts for prisoners' labor expire. The voters of the state have found it to their interest to support prisoners in idleness rather than permit them to compete with honest laborers by working for a living. It is as though a hard working family should find it more desirable to support one of its members in

idleness than to allow him to share in the common labors.

Facts like these are the sort of files which our social system presents for our gnawing. What can be more absurd than to say that it is better to maintain a convict in idleness than to set him to work? what more clear than that if he is set to work he will inevitably throw some honest man out of employment? A logical conclusion and an undeniable fact—there they are, face to face, and what can we do to reconcile them?

There is in mathematics a forcible method of negative demonstration, known as the *reductio ad absurdum*—if a certain proposition be true, then of necessity something else, which is absurd, must be true also, therefore the first proposition is, and must be, false. The present prison labor situation is the last term in just such a chain of demonstration.

Let it be granted that certain individuals, be they many or few, have the right to refuse other men access to the natural material of production—that they have the right to fence in land and hold it as tribal property. Balfour, says the *Herald*, "was no half-hearted evictor. Even in the history of Irish landlordism few more iniquitous extirpations have been recorded." At the time he began his evictions Strathconan was thickly populated, many of its inhabitants being comparatively well to do. Balfour began, says the *Herald*, by depriving them of the hill pastures, held in common. *At one blow he thus reduced them from independence.*" He next deprived them of their arable lands and finally evicted them, converting the depopulated glens into sheep walks and deer forests. Eight districts were thus successively cleared, and the landlord rejoiced when he had made a once populous glen a solitude and forced hundreds of Highland families into the festering slums of great cities or driven them from their native land.

It follows that in this fierce competition men can frequently get no work except as a result of other men getting less work; and that at all times the fewer men there are competing the more favorable will be the terms ... which the "owners" will grant them the privilege of work. And this also is a fact.

It follows that as a result of providing productive work for 1,500 convicts, an equal or a greater number of honest men must be deprived of work, or find their privilege of work endangered; and this also is a fact.

Therefore, as an act of justice to honest workmen, the state should (and does) support its convicts in idleness; which is also a fact.

PLUCK-ME STORES.

Some years ago the Pennsylvania legislature passed a law prohibiting manufacturing and mining companies from paying their laborers in store orders. It was the purpose of this law, by enabling laborers to buy wherever they saw fit, to secure them the benefit of competition in prices; but the supreme court of Pennsylvania has recently declared the law unconstitutional. It says:

The law is an attempt by the legislature to do what in this country cannot be done—that is, to prevent persons from making their own contracts. The act is an infringement of the rights of the employer and employee; more than this, it is an insulting attempt to put the laborer under a legislative tutelage, which is not only degrading to his manhood, but subversive of his rights as a citizen of the United States. He may sell his labor for what he thinks best, whether money or goods, just as his employer may sell his iron and coal; and any and every law that proposes to prevent him from so doing is an infringement of his constitutional privileges, and, consequently, vicious and void.

This is a sound exposition of fundamental law; but it falsely assumes that employer and employee contract on equal terms, and is not in accord with adjudications of analogous questions. We should like to believe that the supreme court of Pennsylvania has risen above expediency and, even at the expense of robbing and impoverishing workingmen, gone back to first principles, as far as the issues of the particular case would permit. We might then hope that when some corporation came before it, claiming the ownership in fee of part of God's earth, this same supreme court would, with equal independence of judge-made law, declare that any and every act of the legislature that proposes to deprive the humblest human creature of his equal right to the soil upon which he is born "is an infringement of his constitutional privileges and consequently vicious and void."

But we suspect that the supreme court of Pennsylvania was actuated by another motive than judicial longing for first principles. Courts are not apt to override established precedents to get at first principles for the mere sake of first principles. And we trust we are not uncharitable in supposing that in this case the court was just a little influenced by the vast business interests which cluster around "store orders" in some parts of Pennsylvania.

Usury laws, though obviously wrong in economic and legal principle, are maintained by precedents without end, every one of which is a case-law rebuke to the Pennsylvania court. Usury laws are as much attempts as the "pluck-me-store law" to do what the Pennsylvania court says cannot be done in this country—"that is, to prevent persons from making their own contracts." Usury laws are infringements of the rights of lenders and borrowers as certainly as the "pluck-me-store" law was an "infringement of the rights of employer and employee." Usury laws are insulting attempts to put borrowers under legislative tutelage if the "pluck-me-store" law was "an insulting attempt to put the laborer under a legislative tutelage." The legislative tutelage is in one case quite as much as in the other degrading to manhood and subversive of the rights of citizens. If a laborer may sell his labor for what he thinks best, why should not a man borrow money for what he thinks best? and if a law that proposes to prevent him from doing the one is void, why is not a law that proposes to prevent him from doing the other void? There is no escape. The analogy is perfect.

The truth is that the landless cannot contract with freedom. They are easily victimized whether they want to sell labor or to borrow money; within certain limits they must accept the terms of the other party to the contract. In cases of borrowing and lending, the legislature puts the

borrower under tutelage, and the courts sustain the law; but in cases of sales of labor the supreme court of Pennsylvania suddenly discovers such a high and mighty admiration for the dignity of labor as to nullify a law which degrades the manhood of the laborer, subverts his rights as a citizen of the United States, and puts him under legislative tutelage by making it a crime for corporations to rob him of his wages under the cloak of a contract.

LANDLORDISM THE SAME EVERYWHERE.

The *Herald* recently printed a special dispatch from Dublin giving an account of the performances of Chief Secretary Balfour's father as an evictor in Scotland, the purpose doubtless being to give its readers an idea of the school in which the young man was trained for his present cruel work.

The elder Balfour was, by English law, the owner of an extensive tract in the Highlands inhabited by people native to the soil, whose ancestors for countless generations had held it as tribal property. Balfour, says the *Herald*, "was no half-hearted evictor. Even in the history of Irish landlordism few more iniquitous extirpations have been recorded." At the time he began his evictions Strathconan was thickly populated, many of its inhabitants being comparatively well to do. Balfour began, says the *Herald*, by depriving them of the hill pastures, held in common. *At one blow he thus reduced them from independence.*" He next deprived them of their arable lands and finally evicted them, converting the depopulated glens into sheep walks and deer forests. Eight districts were thus successively cleared, and the landlord rejoiced when he had made a once populous glen a solitude and forced hundreds of Highland families into the festering slums of great cities or driven them from their native land.

It follows that in this fierce competition

men can frequently get no work except as a result of other men getting less work; and that at all times the fewer men there are competing the more favorable will be the terms ... which the "owners" will grant them the privilege of work.

As this movement grows, for growth it must, the discussions to which it will lead will exert a more powerful educational influence than any number of organizations like the Knights of Labor, useful as that has been and yet is. And as this movement grows it must become broader in its spirit and more definite in its aims. The initiative comes naturally from the workingmen whom the assemblies of Knights of Labor and Central labor unions have been training to act in concert, but as the impulse spreads it must bring into cohesion men of all vocations, and weld them into a party which will probably take for itself some name less subject to narrow interpretations than that of labor party—a party which it is already clear will have for its definite purpose the assurance to all the people of their natural and equal rights in the land. This is the great issue of the future on which political lines will ere long be drawn and political battles fought. Here is the heart of the great labor question, and to this in the nature of things the labor movement in politics must steadily converge.

In the meantime, if there are among us any who dream that social reform is to be brought about by the burning of houses and the bursting of bombs, nothing will render them so innocuous as the turning of the laboring masses to the ballot as a means for the redress of grievances. This is the real "anarchists" know, and none are so bitterly opposed to political action as they.

We print on another page a chapter from "Social Problems," entitled "The American Farmer," which explains at length the vital interest which the working farmers of this country have in the shifting of taxation to land values. The great class with which the working masses of the cities, where the labor movement has its beginnings, must unite in order to control the law making power, are the farmers of the country. This union cannot be effected on small measures which aim solely at some amelioration in the condition of certain classes of wages workers. But it can be effected on the land question. When the farmers come to understand this, as they will as the discussion goes on, they must see that to abolish taxation on the products of industry and to raise further revenues by the taxation of land values is as clearly for their benefit as it is for the benefit of the workingmen of the cities.

The fisheries dispute affords an excellent illustration of the principles and results of a protective policy. The people of the United States are forced to pay higher prices for fish food in order that American fishermen may make more money, and the much-talked of "nursery for seamen" be maintained. This is the theory: the facts are hardly in accord with it. The so-called American fishermen are born and live in Nova Scotia, whence they come to compete with Americans who would like to be fishermen, but can't afford to do it for the wages; and the only nursery maintained by our fish-taxing laws is a nursery of Massachusetts vessel owners who profit by the fact that our tariff drives Nova Scotia fishermen out of business to employ these same Nova Scotians at lower wages than American citizens will work for.

The people of New York, in whose name laws are made and franchises granted, are not likely to derive much benefit from the adoption of any new system of rapid transit in this city. The chief result of the building of the elevated roads has been an advance in rents in the upper part of the city; and the mere agitation for new lines has already had a "beneficial" effect on the prices of uptown lands and made it more difficult than ever for New Yorkers born and bred to live within the limits of their own city. But if these roads were built and run at the expense of public revenues derived from a tax on land values, as was proposed by the platform of the united labor party, then indeed would they make it easier for the masses of New York to find homes.

GOVERNOR HILL'S message vetoing the high license bill is a statesmanlike document. Nothing can be clearer than that to permit the representatives of the rest of the state to make special laws for two cities is to violate the first principle of democratic government, while his showing that New York and Brooklyn have not nearly as many licensed saloons in proportion to population as a number of the smaller cities and villages destroys the very ground on which this piece of special legislation was asked. It is to be hoped that one of the effects of this veto will be to induce the well intentioned people who have united in the support of this makeshift of high license to begin to consider the whole question in a broader light.

A YOUNG man in this city, having a little capital and intending to open a store, found a suitable place and offered to rent it, but the landlord would not let the premises unless the tenant would take a lease for three years. The store project was given up, for the young man, "If my business does not pay, I will be loaded for three years with a lease at high rent, and if it succeeds my rent will be raised as soon as the lease expires. In either case I am likely to be ruined."

MISS AGATHA MUNIER, lately the leader of the choir of St. Stephen's church, has entered on the work of organizing and instructing choruses of male and female voices for active work in the next political campaign. Applications for admission may be made to Miss Munier, at 223 East Thirty-second street.

NOT FORCED TO RESIGN.

The Position of Rev. Thomas W. Illman Toward the Land Doctrine.

A rumor was afloat during the past week that Rev. Thomas W. Illman, pastor of the Third Universalist church, in West Fourteenth street, had been forced to resign on account of strongly urging the election of Henry George last fall. Mr. Illman, on being asked by a STANDARD reporter if the report were true, denied it. He had never announced himself as a supporter of Mr. George's teaching, but had repeatedly said that the views of the writer of that book ought to be the subject of open and fair discussion, notwithstanding the war cries of the men opposed to them. Mr. Illman also said he sympathized with the movement of the masses of this country and of the world in their instinctive efforts to better their condition. Justice was at the bottom of their demands, and was bound to work itself out sooner or later. The press does what men do if a thing is unpopular; it has a good deal to say in opposition to new and radical teachings, but in time it will give them a fair argument. He was on the side of Dr. McGlynn on the ground of liberty of action; there should be no condemnation of political opinions. As Dr. McGlynn believes, social matters are to be adjusted on the principles of human brotherhood—or on the principle of justice right straight through. The permanent welfare of one citizen is bound up in the welfare of all. The question lies in learning how to work together for the benefit of all. Mr. Illman said he opposed boycotting and similar forms of protest. He could not declare himself a convert to the position of Mr. George, but he would say that the spirit in which Mr. George

THE WEEK.

The history of legislation presents few instances of failure to accomplish a desired object by legal enactment more complete than the inter-state commerce act. The intent of the law was plain. It was to relieve the commerce of districts accessible by but a single railway line from the intolerable exactions to which it has hitherto been subjected. It was taken for granted that, where the roads had been in the habit of carrying freight a thousand miles to a competing point for far less money than they charged for transporting the same goods five hundred miles to a non-competing or local station, the effect of the law would be to reduce the local station rate. Instead of this, the railway managers have calculated the competing point rates upon the same basis as the local, and then pointing out to the commissioners that such an enormous increase would be simply prohibitory to all commerce, they have applied for a suspension of the law, generally with success. It seems likely that the whole effect of this legislative experiment, from which so much was expected, will be to provide a few gentlemen with well paid offices, and a good many lawyers with more or less considerable fees.

The truth is that the measure of railway charges, like the measure of all other taxes imposed on the community by private individuals under the sanction of law and custom, is not the needs and deserts of the tax collectors, but the ability of the community to pay. The landlord does not fix his rent according to the price he paid for his land; but estimates the value of the land according to the rent he can command for it; and in the same way the proprietors of a railway, instead of so adjusting rates as to pay simple interest on the cost of their road, reverse the process, and making rates according to what the traffic will bear, figure out the value of their road accordingly. Let a manufacturer start some new enterprise at a local station of the greediest road in the country, and he will need no special legislation to secure him low transportation rates; the railway will encourage his enterprise with all sorts of concessions. But let him succeed and develop a profitable business, and the rates charged him will be the highest that can be demanded without driving him out of business. His freight rates are not a charge for service done, measured by the cost of the service, but a tax upon his enterprise and industry, measured altogether by his ability to pay. And this tax, though collected from the manufacturer, falls largely upon the wage workers who perform the actual labor of production; their wages are reduced that their employer's capital may still earn the interest which alone induces him to continue in business; and these wages are still further cut down by the growing rent tax imposed on them by the local land owner.

The lesson of the failure of the interstate commerce law is simply that it is impossible to allow individuals or corporations to retain a taxing franchise and at the same time compel them to use it with discretion. A law providing that railways shall measure their charges by the cost of services performed is about as logical and as likely to be obeyed as an enactment that rents in the Mulberry Bend should be measured by rents in Podunk Four Corners.

A series of statistics of labor and wages published in *Broadstreet's* of last week, shows that there are probably at least 400,000 more industrial employees at work now than in 1885, and that, as a rule, a moderate gain in wages has been made. Unquestionably, trade and manufacturers are slowly beginning to recover from their long stagnation. Some of the people who have been going without the fabrics and shoes and other things that manufacturers wished to sell are now able to buy them, and the era of what is euphemistically termed "overproduction" seems to be drawing to a close.

The strongest evidence, however, that the country is enjoying a brief season of industrial prosperity, is to be found in the marked increase of immigration and in the amazing advance of land values. The landlord and the immigrant are two unfailing commercial barometers. The first sign of increasing business activity is necessarily shown by an increased demand for land on which to work and live; the storekeeper must have his store, the clerk his boarding house, the laborer his tenement; the higgling of the market settles the amount which each can afford to pay as a tax to the landlord and still retain enough to live upon, and this amount is certain to be exacted to the uttermost farthing as that of an alien.

The protectionist theory of lengthening the blanket by cutting strips off one end and sewing them on to the other leads to queer social complications. The French republic has just arranged to add millions to her annual wealth production by taking money out of the pockets of consumers and putting it into the pockets of certain producers in the shape of protective duties. And now come the Paris workingmen—the felons who eat and pay for, or help eat and pay for, the wheat and rye and beef and bacon whose value has been increased by the new duties—and they want a little protection too. Their demand is logical and modest. They say they have just as good a right as the landowners to have the rest of the community taxed for their benefit; and so they ask to be incorporated into guilds, each with an exclusive franchise of working at some particular trade—no man to be a painter, or a glazier, or a plumber, or a carpenter, or any other kind of a handcraftsman, except by permission, duly certified and paid for, of the guild having proper authority. "What is the use," say these keenly logical Frenchmen, "of protection that doesn't protect. You cut us off from the land and make us pay an extra tax to the people who 'own' it. And then as soon as we get a little compensation in the shape of advanced wages, along comes a lot of Italians and other foreigners to compete for work and take the bread out of our mouths. No, no, messieurs de la government! If you're going to protect anybody, protect us, or —." And what "or" stands for the French authorities know by oft repeated experience. Really, there's no cause grained sort of sense about these Frenchmen.

Some centuries ago the then king of England, having, as Diedrich Knickerbocker puts it, equal rights over all things that didn't belong to him, signed and sealed a piece of parchment certifying that thenceforth and forever certain individuals, whom he christened the Lords Proprietors, their heirs and assigns, should "own" the land since known as the state of New Jersey. The Lords Proprietors by degrees gave away or sold to other people as much of this land as they knew anything about; but their descendants kept up the organization and amuse themselves in this nineteenth century of grace by keeping up a constant search for New Jersey land, whose giving or selling by the original Lords Proprietors was attested by a pen scratch too much or too little, or otherwise invalidated.

The Lords Proprietors have made a find, and a pretty valuable one. They have found a piece of land in Newark which was once a churchyard; but it is a churchyard no longer. The original Lords Proprietors gave it to the church to be used as a burying ground. The church so used it for two hundred years, until the beginning of the present century, and then disposed of it to the city of Newark. The city of Newark built upon it, and leased it to private individuals, who also built upon it. The present generation of Lords Proprietors now come forward, and pointing triumphantly to the word "forever" in the original parchment signed by their dead and gone ancestors, say that the land belongs to them, and they want it. And the present prospect is that they will get it. Perhaps after they have got it and sold it and put the money in their pockets some antiquarian will discover that the dead and gone king of England's Lord Privy Seal's chief document's first clause,

assistant forgot to put the proper stamp on the wax attached to the parchment which "gave" New Jersey to the original Lords Proprietors. What would happen then?

The grand old republican party continues in business at the old stand, and will in the future, still more than in the past, strive to do all things to all men. Senator John Sherman has been announcing this fact lately in divers places and with various verbiage. This is the style in which he states it to the young republican club of Philadelphia: "What you have to do is still further to develop and diversify American industry. It should be our aim to produce everything in this country for which the God of Nature has given us the raw materials, or which is suited to our soil and climate. . . . The equal enjoyment of every civil and political right given by the constitution should be secured by every legal and constitutional means. The shadows and prejudices of the past should be lifted by the lights of modern civilization. The workingman in every condition and employment of life should be encouraged, protected and assisted by every reasonable means to advance his condition and to open up to him, by honest labor and enterprise, all the avenues of wealth and honor."

These are brave words, my masters, and if Mr. Sherman and the rest of the republican party would but act up to them there would be mighty little room for any other political organization. But when Mr. Sherman speaks of the raw materials given to "us" by the God of nature, and talks about "our" soil and "our" climate, he does so with the mental reservation that his pronouns refer, not to American citizens in general, but to the select few among them, of whom he is himself a shining example. And when he says he wants to open up to laboring men all the avenues of wealth and honor, he means that he intends to maintain the right of the workingman to sit on the fence and watch John Sherman and the rest of the lucky ones go by along the avenues in question.

On the whole, we incline to the belief that there are certain possibilities of reform outside the grand old party, in spite of all Senator Sherman may say to the contrary.

Of the motherless babies under the care of the commissioners of charities and correction of this city fifty-eight out of every one hundred die. So says Mrs. Butler, president of the New York committee of the state charities aid association. Mrs. Butler proposes a remedy for this state of things, and says that if the children were boarded out among respectable women near the city the slaughter of the little ones would be diminished.

Judged by the principles so widely accepted among modern theologians and legislators, Mrs. Butler is a highly irreligious person, who proposes nothing less than a flying in the face of providence and an attempt (necessarily futile) to defeat the operation of a law ordained of God. The loving kindness of our Creator has provided that population shall constantly press upon subsistence, and in order that the pressure may not become runously great and reduce us all to a general level of semi-starvation. He has decided that we contumaciously persist in having more children than we ought to. He will kill off the extra ones. And, of course, these wretched little ones squeezed out of society into the almshouses, are the extra ones, whom, if Mrs. Butler succeeds in saving from death, some other children must suffer in their places.

The Illinois legislature is doing a patriotic thing. It is considering, and will probably pass, a bill to make the notorious Mr. Scully, the rack-renting landlord of Tipperary and Illinois, a citizen of the United States. It doesn't say this in the title of the bill, nor in the discussions over its passage, but that is what it is doing all the same. The proposed law provides that all aliens who now hold land in Illinois shall become citizens within three years or forfeit their lands to the state; and it is not at all likely that Mr. Scully will give up his grip on the people of Illinois for the sake of remaining a subject of Queen Victoria. How much better off Mr. Scully's rack-rented Illinois tenants will be for Mr. Scully's citizenship remains to be seen. Probably they will discover that the taxing power of a naturalized landlord is at least as great as that of an alien.

The protectionist theory of lengthening the blanket by cutting strips off one end and sewing them on to the other leads to queer social complications. The French republic has just arranged to add millions to her annual wealth production by taking money out of the pockets of consumers and putting it into the pockets of certain producers in the shape of protective duties. And now come the Paris workingmen—the felons who eat and pay for, or help eat and pay for, the wheat and rye and beef and bacon whose value has been increased by the new duties—and they want a little protection too. Their demand is logical and modest. They say they have just as good a right as the landowners to have the rest of the community taxed for their benefit; and so they ask to be incorporated into guilds, each with an exclusive franchise of working at some particular trade—no man to be a painter, or a glazier, or a plumber, or a carpenter, or any other kind of a handcraftsman, except by permission, duly certified and paid for, of the guild having proper authority.

"What is the use," say these keenly logical Frenchmen, "of protection that doesn't protect. You cut us off from the land and make us pay an extra tax to the people who 'own' it. And then as soon as we get a little compensation in the shape of advanced wages, along comes a lot of Italians and other foreigners to compete for work and take the bread out of our mouths. No, no, messieurs de la government! If you're going to protect anybody, protect us, or —." And what "or" stands for the French authorities know by oft repeated experience. Really, there's no cause grained sort of sense about these Frenchmen.

Some centuries ago the then king of England, having, as Diedrich Knickerbocker puts it, equal rights over all things that didn't belong to him, signed and sealed a piece of parchment certifying that thenceforth and forever certain individuals, whom he christened the Lords Proprietors, their heirs and assigns, should "own" the land since known as the state of New Jersey. The Lords Proprietors by degrees gave away or sold to other people as much of this land as they knew anything about; but their descendants kept up the organization and amuse themselves in this nineteenth century of grace by keeping up a constant search for New Jersey land, whose giving or selling by the original Lords Proprietors was attested by a pen scratch too much or too little, or otherwise invalidated.

The Lords Proprietors have made a find, and a pretty valuable one. They have found a piece of land in Newark which was once a churchyard; but it is a churchyard no longer. The original Lords Proprietors gave it to the church to be used as a burying ground. The church so used it for two hundred years, until the beginning of the present century, and then disposed of it to the city of Newark. The city of Newark built upon it, and leased it to private individuals, who also built upon it. The present generation of Lords Proprietors now come forward, and pointing triumphantly to the word "forever" in the original parchment signed by their dead and gone ancestors, say that the land belongs to them, and they want it. And the present prospect is that they will get it. Perhaps after they have got it and sold it and put the money in their pockets some antiquarian will discover that the dead and gone king of England's Lord Privy Seal's chief document's first clause,

ment in Kilmainham jail, has been appointed canon of Cloyne by the sympathizing bishop having spiritual jurisdiction over him.

The town of Basle, in Switzerland, is largely engaged in the manufacture of knitted goods. The people of the United States unprofitably buy these goods and are duly punished for their economic shortsightedness by being compelled to pay, first, an import duty fine, and second, profit to the importer on the amount of this fine. The manufacturers of Basle, perceiving this condition of affairs, see no reason why, if we are fools enough to insist on fining ourselves for the privilege of wearing knitted goods, they should not profit by our stupidity. So they are going to move their factories and operatives over here, where they can personally collect the import duty fine and the profit thereon for their own benefit. Then the newspapers will chronicle an increase in our manufacturing interests under the fostering care of a protective tariff, and express their astonishment at the foolish complaints of the "laboring classes," who somehow won't be satisfied until they are given more work to do all the time.

The tendency of modern invention to minimize human labor as an element of production has recently received a fresh illustration. An ingenious Englishman, observing that a great many poor people in London make a living by the sale of cigarettes and other small wares, has invented and put into practical use what he terms an "automatic vendor"—a machine, namely, which collects money and delivers goods automatically. A traveler by rail or in a cab, or a guest at a hotel, wanting a cigarette, has merely to drop a halfpenny into a convenient box, when a compartment opens and a cigarette of excellent quality is presented to him. The machine discriminates between good and bad coin, and the quality of the goods furnished is guaranteed by the proprietors of the invention. Thus far the system has been applied only to cigarette vending, about 7,000 boxes having been placed in railway carriages, cabs and elsewhere; but it is in contemplation to extend it to the sale of ounces of tea, bottles of perfume, voice lozenges, matches, mineral waters and other matters. That the machines will be introduced into the United States goes without saying, and within a few years we may be able to make the majority of our minor purchases in this noiseless and labor saving manner.

A large number of small capitalist wage earners will thus be crowded out of business, and forced into the ranks of unemployed labor, and whose will be the benefit? The manager of the London automatic vendor company answers this question. He says: "We will pay fifteen per cent on the takings to the railway companies, which we estimate will, in course of time, be equal to £20,000 per annum."

So the work goes on. Day by day the marvelous inventive faculties of the human mind tend to render labor less and less necessary to human comfort and enjoyment, and humanity, instead of being happier for each lightening of the primal curse, is made only the more miserable. Men and women who enjoy the privilege of existence on this planet only on condition that they find somebody to buy their labor, can hardly be expected to welcome inventions which, by lessening toil, lessen also the demand for the one thing they have to sell. The automatic vendors will be a boon to landlords and an injury to capital and employes.

The last issue of the London *Spectator* contains a bit of friendly advice to young Englishmen "of the better class," who may be thinking of coming over to the United States in search of an easy road to fortune. These youngsters, according to the *Spectator*, are dreaming of cattle ranches, horse ranches, orange groves, vineyards, etc., all to be had for little or nothing, and all certain to make their possessors rich within a few years. But alas! the *Spectator* tells them, things aren't as they used to be. "All the best ranch grounds are in the hands of large and rich companies or millionaires, with whom no newcomer can compete;" there is some land left fit for orange groves, but the best is all occupied; all the choice vineyard lands are taken; in short, the present generation of "better class" young Englishmen is just a day behind the fair, and "though it is quite possible to do well in other industries and in ordinary farming, nothing beyond a decent living can be earned."

Utterances like this in English journals are good food for American thought.

Facts and Thoughts From a Trade Paper.
St. Louis Age of Steel.

We are not in our province in this paper to particularize or define the claims and facts pertinent to industrial agitation. We can, however, summarize the problem as being resolved into a claim for the principle of distribution as against and corrective of monopolization. This is the kernel of the nut. We quote the following figures from a paper prepared for the Commercial club of Chicago as illustrative:

The machinery of this country is controlled by 21,000 men, there being 10,250,000 men affected and governed thereby. Two million seven hundred and fifty thousand hands receive a wage of \$10 a year. Of these, 52,000 are women and 182,000 children. The average wage of farm hands, of which there are 8,000,000, is \$28 a year, or less than 80 cents a day. Vanderbilt made more from 1880 to 1885 than a million farmers. The profits of 2,000 banks are equal to the earnings of 500,000 farmers; the net gains of 100 railroad companies to the earnings of 2,500,000 farmers; 200,000 stockholders in railways owning 170,000 miles of road, representing with equipments about \$8,000,000,000 charge for services \$800,000,000 and pay some 300,000 employees about a dollar a day.

We are no guarantee for the absolute truth of these figures; there is, however, no disputing the fact that the increasing power of wealth and inequalities in its distribution have a tremendous emphasis in labor discontent. As an adjunct and logical consequence we find ourselves nearing the point in wealth in which luxury makes pleasure the object of life and labor its worst misfortune. We are paying \$500 for a dress, \$5,000 for a pair of earrings, and going to the White house with some \$30,000 of jewelry adorning five feet and a half of ordinary humanity. We give \$1,000 a night to an opera singer, whilst in the same city some poor seamstress is earning 25 cents a dozen working at button holes, and men are glad to pick a herring bone in sight of a palace where others are banqueting on wine \$10 a bottle and strawberries 50 cents a piece. If history has a lesson for us on this matter, it has an unpleasant significance.

Greece was in its noon of art and luxury when Phidias was filling the Parthenon with immortal sculpture, but the stamina and vitality of the people were gone and left them an easy prey to the ruder races who fought well and knew nothing of luxury. Rome went the same way. The Pantheon was but the tomb of a degenerated race. France was a banquet hall for its nobles when the volcans of revolution inaugurated the reign of terror, and just as surely as we run the same way we will fall over the same stump.

The New Crusade in Brooklyn.

A number of citizens in the Bedford district in Brooklyn intend to meet Saturday evening, April 16, in Thayer's hall, corner of Bedford and Fulton avenues, to organize a land and labor club. Louis F. Post, James P. Kohler and Rev. Chas. P. McCarthy will address the meeting. A large attendance is expected, and a vigorous propaganda of the truths of the new crusade will doubtless be started.

They manage these things differently in Ireland. Father Keller of Youghal, who carried his advocacy of the wicked theories of land reform so far as to bring himself within the compass of the law, and to lead to his lodges;

THE WEEK IN WALL STREET.

The observance in Boston of the Massachusetts fast day and the partial observance of Good Friday in New York, together with the Easter Monday holiday in London, gave dullness to the tone of speculation and a downward tendency to prices. Money on Thursday was bid up to fifteen per cent, but the banks soon had their brokers on the floor offering round lots on call at six per cent. The weekly bank statement showed an increase in loans of \$5,000,000, with but little over a quarter of a million decrease in reserve. This discrepancy is to be accounted for by the fact that in times of stringency the clearing house banks borrow largely from the savings banks of the city. They borrow on their governments at three per cent and discount or loan on the street at from six to ten per cent, in this way bridging the chasm while making a handsome profit off the deposits of the laboring population.

The market has fluctuated somewhat while exhibiting a strong undertone. Realizations have been very heavy, but the believers in higher prices have absorbed stocks without causing a very marked recession in prices. The commission houses believe that speculation will be encouraged if a slight drop takes place, so that while the cliques are booming things the slumps and bulges will not be infrequent. Jersey Central has marched right along, scoring a five point rise in one day, while governments continue still to be a feature.

The temporary suspension, in favor of the southern system of roads, of the long and short haul clause has led the street to believe that the interstate commission will throw no very formidable obstacles in the way of Wall street interests, so that the congressional railroad legislation will, for the present at least, be counted out so far as its direct effects on speculation are concerned.

Indirectly, however, the law may have a tremendous influence on quotations. The Grand Trunk of Canada, for instance, does not come within the purview of the bill, and, as this road has a longer route than the other trunk lines, if no provision is made for differential rates in their behalf, it may kick up a rumpus by getting what business it can on whatever terms it pleases. If it turns scab the Baltimore and Ohio and the Ontario and Western (which has lately hung out its sign as a competitor for through business) will probably also jump the traces. And if these three lines begin a little war of their own the stronger roads have forced either bankruptcy or submission on the weaker. The one thing that Wall street hates more than a strike is a railroad war, and it will require no little tact and not a few concessions to avert this dreaded calamity. Some of the roads are decidedly opposed to granting any concessions to the Grand Trunk on account of their disadvantages, and the Grand Trunk has not decided yet to be governed by the rates made by the shorter lines. The Pennsylvania and the Lake Shore have taken a decided stand against the paying of commissions to agents on through tickets over other roads. They stopped it on their own roads, and are boycotting the western roads that continue to allow a commission by refusing to sell tickets over their lines. The Pennsylvania holds that this is the only way to stop rate cutting and discrimination, as the agent can divide his commission with the purchaser, and the only thing necessary to underpin a competitor is to increase the agent's commission.

The directory of Western Union have authorized a further issue of 12,000 shares of stock to cover scrip dividends, and also an unlimited amount of five per cent bonds to cover their guarantees of dividends on companies controlled by Western Union. There is a law in this state against stock watering, the object of which is to prevent the payment of dividends on any but actual capital; but Western Union, in its palmyr days, found a way to get around this law. It was just as much to its purpose to organize new companies and guarantee dividends on their stock as to issue stock of its own. It organized too many of these bubbles, and now, that it is down in the hole under free telegraphic competition, it is to fund these obligations in a five per cent bond and pump still more water into its already drooping corporosity. The court may intervene and enjoin Mr. Gould from playing this old trick of his to add a still greater burden on his already overburdened and underpaid employees.

Local improvements are getting their share of attention in financial circles. Investors have not overlooked the fact that New York, with its rapid increase in population, offers to capital as good a field as any in this country, and there has been lately considerable talk of extensions of old lines and buildings of new—both elevated and surface. A petition to the assembly for a Broadway elevated franchise is being circulated, as is also one headed by President Hyde of the Equitable building against granting such a privilege.

Cyrus W. Field often boasts that the Manhattan elevated franchise is alone worth \$50,000,000, and a Broadway franchise on this basis ought to be worth half as much. These valuable franchises, taxed at six per cent, would yield to the city treasury nearly \$5,000,000 per annum, and cause a reduction of taxation on business that would be quite perceptible. The comptroller is advertising for bids for a right of way through Fulton and Forty-second streets, from river to river, and the Manhattan company is clamoring for more room at the Battery, while the elevated railroad organs are laying great stress upon the sufferings of the poor public, resulting from the unavoidable (f) overcrowding on its lines. Apropos of all this, it is proposed to relieve the competition for standing room on Manhattan island by building at once the East river Blackwell's island bridge, for which the present company has long had a charter. No less a personage than Mr. Austin Corbin is behind this scheme, and as the company has in its plans wisely provided to sweep all the traffic, by loading on cars goods, passengers and wagons, it is likely this will also be a valuable franchise. It will have the effect of booming the north shore of Long Island, and making millionaires of some of the water front landowners.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

The Mortgaged Farmer.

LAVERNE, Minn.—I am a western farmer. My condition is not a happy one. I am working and all my family are working for a capitalist that holds a mortgage on my farm. When I got into debt farm produce was high and land was high; now farm produce is low and land is low. The amount of my debt and the interest on the same—they don't follow down; on the contrary, they have tendency to get bigger and bigger. My only hope at present is that there will again come a time of higher prices, when my earnings will be larger, my land higher, and I may get out of debt. I am firmly convinced that if land was taxed for its rent value and everything else was free, my condition would be better, for so much land would come into free use that I would have no rent tax to pay at all. But here's the rub: my improvements, my stock, my tools, all I've got, in short, would have to go to pay off my mortgage. The result would lose something, but I would lose everything, and how could I then take advantage of the free land that would lay all around me! My case is one of thousands, and while we can see the advantage of the George plan, it seems as though we would have to pay more than our fair share to bring it about. What do you think?

JOHN HERMANN.

It is indeed your only hope that there will come a time when your earnings will be larger. Should that time not come your mortgagee will in form as well as in effect own both your land and your capital, and you and your family will be working as hired servants. Could the taxation of land values possibly put you in a worse plight than that you face now?

You must have contracted your debt before the contraction of our national currency. Your statement that the price of land is less now than when you got into debt would indicate that local causes have shrunk land prices here and there, but land prices generally have not diminished since what are commonly known as "inflation times." Having contracted your debt then, the effect of a shrinkage of the volume of currency was to increase the debt, and you are now bound to pay your mortgage considerably more in labor products than you borrowed; and although your interest is nominally the same or less than you contracted to pay, it is, in products, much more.

You are probably right in supposing that the land of your farm has no real value, but only a speculative value, and that if land values alone were taxed, so much farm land in your neighborhood would be free that you would have no tax to pay; and since you are so firmly convinced that this would improve your condition, we are at a loss to understand your fears.

Let us endeavor to look at your case with the eye of prophecy. You understand, of course, that the shifting of taxes from products to land values will be a gradual process. Where it will begin no one can yet tell; but let us suppose, for illustration, that it begins in congress with the abolition of the tariff and the raising of federal revenues by a direct tax apportioned among the states according to population, but levied upon land values alone.

How would this affect you?

You would have a direct federal tax to pay, which you do not pay now. How much that would be we cannot undertake to say; but you can figure it out approximately by ascertaining about how much federal revenue would be required, about what proportion the value of your land bears to all the land values of your state and what proportion the population of your state bears to the population of the United States. It must be evident to you without calculation that it would be a trifling tax. That would be the extent of your loss, or investment, as it would be more correctly to call it.

Now, what would be your gain?

At present on most articles of foreign production that you buy you pay an indirect tax to the government. Your village storekeeper is the tax collector. Of tax you would be relieved.

You also pay on such articles something more than the tax, namely, interest and risk of loss on the capital invested by the storekeeper in the tax. If an article could be imported and transported to your village for \$1, your storekeeper would require but a dollar of capital to bring the article within your reach, and the interest and insurance you would have to pay him for holding that article in readiness for your demand would be based on a dollar only. But if there is a sixty per cent ad valorem revenue tariff on such goods, you must not only pay your storekeeper \$1.60, but also interest and insurance based on \$1.60. To take an arbitrary example for illustration (omitting the storekeeper's wage for simplicity), let us suppose that average interest and risk would give the storekeeper ten per cent for interest and five per cent for insurance. Then if there were no tariff, you would have to pay him \$1.15 for the imported article; but if there were a sixty per cent tariff you would have to pay him, not \$1.75, but \$1.84, or nine cents in addition to the tariff. Of this expense you would also be relieved.

But the tariff casts on you a heavier burden still. You are taxed on very many articles of domestic production, as well as on foreign articles, and this tax does not go into the public treasury, but into the pockets of privileged manufacturers. If, for instance, an article made abroad can be brought to your village store for a dollar, and a tax of 30 per cent is laid on it, your storekeeper cannot sell it for less (excluding his wages, interest and risk) than \$1.60. Taking advantage of this, manufacturers of domestic goods of the same kind fix a price on their products that compels the storekeeper to charge you almost or quite as much as he charges for the foreign article. This is a disadvantage to the storekeeper, for he could do better through quicker sales and better wages by investing his extra sixty cents in other goods than by investing it in a tax on goods he has already bought, and it is certainly a disadvantage to you, for you must foot all the bills. Of this private tax for the benefit of a privileged class, which the tariff imposes, and of interest and insurance on that tax, you would also be relieved.

Besides these absolute savings, you would enjoy a great advantage in the impetus that free trade accompanied by higher tax on land values would give to production. The tax on land values would have a tendency to bring more land into the market, in the city as well as in the country, to lower the value of land and to reduce rents. As you own land this might at first blush seem injurious to you, and if you expected to pay off your mortgage by selling your land it would be so, temporarily. But as your interests as a laborer and capital owner are greater, even now, than as a land-owner, and as you prefer no doubt to pay off your mortgage out of your earnings, it could not help you greatly. Your land would be just as useful, just as productive, just as desirable to you as it is now, and the net product, as you have seen, would be greater. The only difference to you would be that you could not get so much for the land if you sold

it; and to that difference you would be indifferent, as you could get land just as good in every respect for the same price. If you wanted to trade land for land you could do as well as you can now; if you wanted to trade land for labor products you could not do so well; but if you wanted to trade labor products for labor products you could do better.

The reduction of land values would in itself encourage production, as you already understand. The abolition of tariff taxes would revive international commerce and open the markets of the world to your produce, while greater consumptive power at home, consequent on better wages, would quicken your domestic markets; from which, as you must see, the larger earnings on which you rely to lift your mortgage would speedily come. Before any further step was taken in the direction of shifting all taxes to land values, your mortgage would be worked off and your condition would be a happier one.

Do you think that, thus far, you would have to pay more than your share to bring about the change?

Without speculating as to what might be the next step, let us suppose that it were the shifting of all local taxes to land values. Much the same effect, only in greater degree, would be produced. The consumer would no longer pay for the support of the state. Its revenue would be derived from men who occupied or kept out of the land that other people wanted. Production would be multiplied, exchange would be active and prosperity would depend upon industry instead of speculation. Meantime your wages would be higher, the returns to your capital would increase, and only the value of your land, the basis of your taxes, would diminish. Would that condition make you pay more than your share to bring about the change?

When the movement had reached this stage, the speculative value of land would be practically killed. The better lands would still have a value, but only for use, since few would care to pay the tax in hope of profiting by a rise. This value would be ample for all the purposes of government, and as values increased from this solid foundation, as they would, a gradual increase of taxation for public use might be instituted which would ultimately leave to the occupier the full fruit of his labor and capital, and secure for public purposes that increment of value which public demand creates.

There is probably no class in the community that would sooner realize the advantages of this land value tax than farmers who, with their families, are working for mortgages.

Overproduction—Middlemen—Railroads.

BOSTON, Mass.—(1) If taxes were on land values only, would there not be too much wheat, corn, etc., produced, so glutting the market and causing a stagnation of business and lowering of the price of farm products, cattle raising, etc., as to drive a great deal of capital away from that line, and to leave little, if any, remuneration for the poorer farmers? (2) How would the middlemen, who make the greatest profits, be driven out that the farmer might receive a fair share of the profits of his labor? (3) How would railroad corporations be taxed? Their rolling stock, road, in fact their entire plant, is under the head of improvements, according to your classification, and is therefore exempt from taxation, although the colossal fortunes of this country to-day were mostly made through this system.

XERXES.

(1) When production and exchange are free all kinds of production tend constantly to an equilibrium, as water tends to a level. Overproduction in one direction is the correlative of underproduction in other directions, just as congestion of blood in one part of the system is the correlative of insufficient blood in other parts; and as tendencies to congestion in the human body are overcome by free circulation, tendencies to over production in the social organism are overcome by free production and exchange. By placing all taxes on land values we secure this freedom. The producer then pays nothing on his products or for the right to produce, but only for superior advantages, and for them he pays to the community, of which he himself is a part, instead of paying, as he does now, to some privileged member of the community.

If, with a tax exclusively on land values in operation, an overproduction of anything, whether of wheat, corn, cattle, houses, watches or machinery, was indicated by declining value, labor and capital would drift at once into those employments in which there was an underproduction, and speedily restore the equilibrium. But this drift of labor and capital would be a drift and not a leap. When a dam backs the water of a stream up over the banks and upon the level land beyond, the level land may be reclaimed by tearing away the dam. But if that be done the atoms of water on the level land will not leap away; they will drift away as the atoms nearer the dam make room for them. So in free production and exchange. The farmer whose products were becoming a glut, for example, would not leap from farming to the making of silk, but at one extreme some cloth makers would turn their attention to silk, and at the other some farmers would go into a more advanced order of agriculture, while between these two extremes there would be a similarly partial and slight shifting of vocations—the whole tending to the equalization of values.

Political economists recognize this law; but what they fail to recognize, and what makes it appear that the law does not exist, are the barriers with which private ownership of land obstructs free production and exchange. (2) The middleman would not be driven out. The middleman who brings articles from where they are produced to where they are needed for consumption, or who gathers various articles of consumption and holds them in store so as to supply consumers from time to time, according to their demands, is as truly a producer as the man who makes the articles. He, like the farmer, is a public servant, and should not be driven out. Nor is that necessary in order to give the farmer "a fair share of the profit of his labor." Middlemen—some middlemen—make great profits now, because they have special advantages directly conferred by law, as in the case of railroads; or control great capital in a state of society which makes it impossible for the mere laborer to accumulate the capital he creates, as in the case of merchant princes; and farmers make small profits or none because they are burdened with enormous taxes and their independence is destroyed by our system of private land ownership. Let taxes be shifted to land values and the farmer's burden would be lifted and his independence restored; the same benefits that he enjoyed would be enjoyed by the middleman of small capital, and the middleman of great capital would no longer be able to take advantage of his unfortunate neighbor.

(3) Railroads cannot be operated without a taxing franchise conferred by the state. The state has no right to confer such franchises. It has no right to farm out any of its

functions. Therefore, railroads should be managed by the state. But you are mistaken in supposing that railroads privately owned would escape taxation. The land values they appropriate are enormous.

An Outlet for Surplus Labor.

HINSDALE, Ill.—In the great towns of this continent millions of people are already crowded, fiercely struggling for subsistence; and still the herdsmen desert his pastures and the farmer his fields to gather where the wild prairie and the desert and exhaust him. Would it not be well to carefully consider, for the sake of humanity, the question, Why do people flock into towns to suffer loss of comfort, independence and self-respect while vast areas of fertile land lie available but unused by man? Within day's easy travel from any one of the great cities of the Union less than the rental of a modest house in those cities for a single man and his household of one, including food and board and sustenance within the borders of two or three of the states of the Union. If all the inhabitants of the earth were divided into families of five, a single state would afford half an acre of land to each family; and that state would then have millions of acres unoccupied. The United States could furnish food enough for the whole human race, and not use a tenth of its land for growing the food required. Probably not a country on earth has ever been cultivated to its utmost capacity of production.

It has been asserted that the land belongs by God given right to all men equally, and that millions have been robbed of that birth-right by men whose only title to more land than is needed for their own support is that they have power to hold that land, a power created and sustained only by complicity of other robbers operating through what are called laws. These assertions are made in face of the known fact that many countries will give to any man who wants it a farm of size ample. The only conditions are that the man shall not encroach upon the land of others, and shall pay the small fee required for recording his right to possession and furnishing evidence and protection of that right.

In America the man who chooses to secure his share of the land held in trust for him by the government, is limited in his choice of location by only the one condition that he shall not dispossess any one already holding the land rightfully. First comes first served is the law in this as in all other business affairs. Millions of acres of rich land are still offered by this nation to any who will go to the trouble to toil, who have been studiously accepted by toilers discontented with the old world workers who have on such lands already made themselves more truly independent than are any of the princes whom they once obeyed.

There will not soon be a lack of fertile untilled land in the world. Careful estimates place the total population of the world at 1,400,000,000 people. If all the land of the United States were occupied by industrious families, the new world would still afford ample room for as many people as are now on earth. Over an area extending from the Andes to the Arctic, where no one now lives, millions of acres, notwithstanding our northern boundary, grain can be grown successfully, and men live in comparative comfort there. In Central America are lands of surpassing fertility under a climate as salubrious as any known, and within a week's ride from the wharves of New York. There all the necessary food, clothing and housing can be got by a minimum of labor. The grand breadth of South America, most of it of exceeding richness, is practically unoccupied and will yet support millions of men in ease and plenty. Australia, Africa and comparative unknown country, scarcely a hundredth part of which has been surveyed by white men. In central Africa lie immense plains and broad valleys, where vegetation flourishes most luxuriantly and domesticated animals thrive, and where mighty nations may yet have their homes in the midst of abundance. In Russia are vast regions which are destined to support immense multitudes, for they are better adapted for that use than are the prairies of our own western states and territories; and the list of free lands is by no means exhausted.

It is evident that those who now cry out against the oppression of the capitalist can not use the opportunities given by the land laws of the various countries mentioned, because money is required to enable them to even reach the lands offered. Is not sufficient answer given to that by the example of hundreds of pioneers who shouldered ax and rifle and boldly trudged away to the unbroken wilderness, there to face the Indian and other savage enemies while conquering new forests, those hardy men clearing the land by hand, feeding their cattle, planting and harvested their crops, often without the aid of so much as a single dollar of money. They braved obstacles and dangers that can scarcely be found in this country to-day, and they developed their manly independence. A few weeks ago the papers told of a young man and his wife who together walked from Canada to Wisconsin, sturdily trudging over the long way that they might save money which of which to pay for land. Is it likely that people of such grand spirit will soon be compelled to give up their land? Will not be refused to them if they ask it?

"But why should we be driven into the wilderness?" I have been asked, "to live deprived of every comfort and advantage that other men enjoy?" Why should our children go without schools, our wives without churches, and we without the pleasures of association with our fellows and friends? To these questions there may be many answers; but is it necessary to do this to become independent? Is it not the money now spent on amusement, for dissipation, on wages to wage workers through strikes and their consequences, sufficient to pay in a few years, at the average price of lands east of the Mississippi river, for ground enough to furnish employment and a comfortable living to the families of half the wage workers in the land? Would not the savings of a few months suffice to carry the head of the family to the free lands offered for his acceptance, where he might make a home for those dependent on him?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole shown that the attempt to control the price of labor, by any method other than by wages, must be useless? Is it not the employer who, by his overstocking of the labor market, causes the price of labor to fall?

It is believed that employers, by combination of one kind or another, rob the workingman of a large part of his fair share of the results of his toil. Is it not rather the workingman who robs his fellow, who in turn robs the robber by overstocking the labor market? Is it not to control this keen competition in a market already glutted that labor unions of various kinds have been formed? Has not the result of the efforts of the labor unions as a whole

THE AMERICAN FARMER.

Special Problems. Chapter XX.

The average farmer may at first start at the idea, but given time for discussion and reflection, and those who are already trying to persuade him that to put all taxation on the value of land would be to put all taxation on the farmer, have as little chance of success as the slaveholders had of persuading their negroes that the northern armies were bent on kidnapping and selling them in Cuba. The average farmer can read, write and cipher—and on matters connected with his own interests ciphers pretty closely. He is not out of the great currents of thought, though they may affect him more slowly, and he is anything but a contented peasant, ignorantly satisfied with things as they are and impervious to ideas of change. Already dissatisfied, he is becoming more so. His hard and barren life seems harder and more barren in contrast with the excitement and luxury of cities; and the great fortunes accumulated by men who do nothing to add to the stock of wealth arise from his sense of injustice. He is beginning to feel that he bears more than his fair share of the burdens of society and gets less than his fair share of its benefits; and his thought, with the decadence of old political issues, is more and more turning to economic and social questions.

It is clear that the change in taxation which I propose as the means whereby equal rights to the soil may be asserted and maintained, would be to the advantage of farmers who are working land belonging to others, to the advantage of those whose farms are virtually owned by mortgagees, and to the advantage of those who are seeking farms.

The farmer who cultivates his own farm with his own hands is a landowner, it is true, but he is in greater degree a laborer, and in his ownership of stock, improvements, tools, etc., a capitalist. It is from his labor, aided by this capital, rather than from any advantage represented by the value of his land, that he derives his living. His main interest is that of a producer, not that of a landowner.

There lived in Dublin, some years ago, a gentleman named Murphy—"Cozy" Murphy, they called him, for short, and because he was a very comfortable sort of a Murphy. Cozy Murphy owned land in Tipperary; but as he had an agent in Tipperary to collect his rents and evict his tenants when they did not pay, he himself lived in Dublin, as being the more comfortable place. And he concluded, at length, that the most comfortable place in Dublin, in fact the most comfortable place in the whole world, was—in bed. So he went to bed and stayed there for nearly eight years; not because he was at all ill, but because he liked it. He ate his dinners, and drank his wine, and smoked his cigars, and read, and played cards, and received visitors, and verified his agent's accounts, and drew checks—all in bed. After eight years' lying in bed, he grew tired of it, got up, dressed himself, and for some years went around like other people, and then died. But his family were just as well off as though he had never gone to bed—in fact, they were better off, for while his income was not a whit diminished by his going to bed, his expenses were.

This was a typical landowner—a landowner pure and simple. Now let the farmer consider what would become of himself and family if he and his boys were to go to bed and stay there, and he will realize how much his interests as a laborer exceed his interests as a landowner.

It requires no grasp of abstractions for the working farmer to see that to abolish all taxation, save upon the value of land, would be really to his interest, no matter how it might affect larger landholders. Let the working farmer consider how the weight of indirect taxation falls upon him without his having power to shift it off upon anyone else; how it adds to the price of nearly everything he has to buy, without adding to the price of what he has to sell; how it compels him to contribute to the support of government in far greater proportion to what he possesses than it does those who are much richer, and he will see that by the substitution of direct for indirect taxation he would be largely the gainer. Let him consider further, and he will see that he would be still more largely the gainer if direct taxation were confined to the value of land. The land of the working farmer is improved land, and usually the value of the improvements and of the stock used in cultivating it bear a very high proportion to the value of the bare land. Now, as all valuable land is not improved as is that of the working farmer, as there is much more of valuable land than of improved land, to substitute for the taxation now levied upon improvements and stock, a tax upon the naked value of land, irrespective of improvements, would be manifestly to the advantage of the owners of improved land, and especially of small owners, the value of whose improvements bears a much greater ratio to the value of their land than is the case with larger owners; and who, as one of the effects of treating improvements as a proper subject of taxation, are taxed far more heavily, even upon the value of their land, than are larger owners.

The working farmer has only to look about him to realize this. Near by his farm of eighty or one hundred and sixty acres he will find tracts of five hundred or a thousand, or, in some places, tens of thousands of acres, of equally valuable land, on which the improvements, stock, tools and household effects are much less in proportion than on his own small farm, or which may be totally unimproved and unused. In the villages he will find acre, half-acre and quarter-acre lots unimproved or slightly improved, which are more valuable than his whole farm. If he looks further he will see tracts of mineral land, or land with other superior natural advantages having immense value, yet on which the taxable improvements amount to little or nothing; while, when he looks to the great cities he will find vacant lots twenty-five by one hundred feet, worth more than a whole section of agricultural land such as his; and as he goes toward their centers, he will find most magnificent buildings less valuable than the ground on which they stand, and block after block where the land would sell for more per front foot than his whole farm. Manifestly, to put all taxes on the value of land would be to lessen relatively and absolutely the taxes the working farmer has to pay.

So far from the effect of placing all taxes upon the value of land being to the advantage of the towns at the expense of the agricultural districts, the very reverse of this is obviously true. The great increase of land values is in the cities, and with the present tendencies of growth, this must continue to be the case. To place all taxes on the value of land would be to reduce the taxation of agricultural districts relatively to the taxation of towns and cities. And this would be only just; for it is not alone the presence of their own populations which gives value to the land of towns and cities, but the presence of the more scattered agricultural population, for whom they constitute industrial, commercial and financial centers.

While at first blush it may seem to the farmer that to abolish all taxes upon other things than the value of land would be to exempt the richer inhabitants of cities from taxation and unduly to tax him, discussion and reflection will certainly show him that the reverse is the case. Personal property is not, never has been and never can be, fairly taxed. The rich man always escapes more easily than the man who has but little; the city more easily than the country. Taxes which add to prices bear upon the inhabitants of sparsely settled districts with as much

weight, and in many cases with much more weight, than upon the inhabitants of great cities. Taxes upon improvements manifestly fall more heavily upon the working farmer, a great part of the value of whose farm consists of the value of improvements, than upon the owners of valuable unimproved land, or upon those whose land, as that of cities, bears higher relation in value to the improvements.

The truth is, that the working farmer would be an immense gainer by the change. Where he would have to pay more taxes on the value of his land, he would be released from the taxes now levied on his stock and improvements, and from all the indirect taxes that now weigh so heavily upon him. And as the effect of taxing uninproved land as heavily as though it were improved would be to compel more holders to sell, and to destroy mere speculative values, the farmer in sparsely settled districts would have little or no taxes to pay. It would not be until equally good land all about him was in use, and he had all the advantages of a well settled neighborhood, that his land would have any taxable value.

What the farmer who owns his own farm would lose would be in the selling value of his land; but its usefulness to him would be as great as before—greater than before, in fact, as he would get larger returns from his labor upon it; and as the selling value of other land would be similarly affected, this loss would not make it harder for him to get another farm if he wished to move, while it would be easier for him to settle his children or to get more land if he could advantageously cultivate more. The loss would be nominal; the gain would be real. It is better for the small farmer, and especially for the small farmer with a growing family, that labor should be high than that land should be high. Paradoxical as it may appear, small landowners do not profit by the rise in the value of land. On the contrary they are extinguished. But before speaking of this, let me show how much misapprehension there is in the assumption that the small independent farmers constitute, and will continue to constitute, the majority of the American people.

Agriculture is the primitive occupation; the farmer is the American pioneer; and even in those cases, comparatively unimportant, where settlement is begun in the search for the precious metals, it does not become permanent until agriculture in some of its branches takes root. But as population increases and industrial development goes on, the relative importance of agriculture diminishes. That the non-agricultural population of the United States is steadily and rapidly gaining on the agricultural population is of course obvious. According to the census report the urban population of the United States was in 1790 but 3.3 per cent of the whole population, while in 1880 it had risen to 22.5 per cent. (1) Agriculture is yet the largest occupation, but in the aggregate other occupations much exceed it.

According to the census, which, unsatisfactory as it is, is yet the only authority we have, the number of persons engaged in agriculture in 1880 was 7,670,493 out of 17,392,699 returned as engaged in gainful occupations of all kinds. Or, if we take the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. Or, if we take the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number of adult males as a better comparison of political power, we may find with a little figuring, that the returns show 6,491,116 males of sixteen years and over engaged in agricultural occupations of all kinds. This is, however, not quite so accurate as the number

